A

# DISCOURSE

Concerning

## *SANCHONIATHON's*

## Phœnician Hiſtory.

By *HENRY DODWELL*, M. A.
and ſometimes Fellow of *Trinity-Colledge* near *Dublin* in *Ireland*.

*LONDON*, Printed for *Benjamin Tooke*, and are to be Sold by *Walter Kettilby*, at the *Biſhop's-Head* in St. *Paul's-Church-yard*, MDCXCI.

# THE CONTENTS.

THE Occaſion *of this Diſcourſe*, §. I. *The* Uſefulneſs, §. II. *The* Credit *of* Sanchoniathon's *Work depends either on* Porphyry, *or* Philo Byblius, §. III. *The* Philoſophers *allowed a Liberty of* Beneficial Falſehoods; *and they who firſt produced this Author were, in* Intereſt *concerned for him*, §. IV. Theodoret *and* Cyril *of* Alexandria *quote him only at the ſecond hand from* Euſebius. *Several groſs miſtakes of* Cyril, §. V, VI. Sanchoniathon *very little known* before *he was produced by* Porphyry, §. VII, VIII. *No reaſon why he might not have been known, even* before *the time of* Philo Byblius, *if he had been really genuine*, §. IX. *He might have been taken notice of, not only as a* Hiſtorian, *but as a* Philoſopher, §. X. *Concerning his* Means *of* Information. *The* Writings *of* Taautus. *The Antient way of preſerving* Antiquities *by* Inſcriptions *on* Sacred Pillars, *ſometimes* abuſed, *and very* fit *for the deſigns of* Deceivers, §. XI. *This was generally pretended to by thoſe who Rivalled each other for* Antiquity. *The* Pro-

phecy *of* Cham *and the* Pillars *of* Seth *contained the same Doctrines with those of* Mercury, §. XII, XIII. Taautus *the same with* Mercury. *The* Ammonian Philosophy *the same with the* Ægyptian, §. XIV. *It is improbable that* Sanchoniathon *could derive his Information from the* Books *of* Mercury, §. XV. Mercury *no* Phœnician, §. XVI. *The Pretences of* Philo Byblius *for defence of his Author*, §. XVII. *It is not probable that the* Antient Ægyptians *would have suffered* Mercury *to have* Revealed *their* Mysteries, §. XVIII. *It is not probable that the* Ægyptian Mercury *either* would *or* could *have* Revealed *them*, §. XIX. *The Son of* Thabion *perhaps the* Second Mercury *called* Agathodæmon. *He is supposed to be the Author of the Modern* Greek Writings *Fathered on* Mercury (*which if meant by* Sanchoniathon *must be a certain Conviction of his False-hood*) *perhaps first published by* Numenius, §. XX. *By* Hierom-baal *Priest of the God* Jevo *he meant* Gideon. Sanchoniathon *could not mistake him for a* Priest. Bochart *mistaken*, §. XXI. *It is not Credible that* Gideon *ever left any* Memoirs *behind him*, §. XXII. Sanchoniathons *account of* Jewish *Affairs could not have been taken from them*, §. XXIII.

§. XXIII. Intrinsick *Arguments of just Suspicion against this Author. His arrogating to his* own Country *the Glory of all Famous* Persons *and* Inventions, §. XXIV. *Several Instances hereof,* §. XXV, XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII. *An Account of the design of* Philo Byblius *in this Imposture. He was disaffected to the* Jews, *and perhaps set on this design by occasion of* Josephus's *Books against* Appion, §. XXIX. Josephus *there insisted more particularly on the Testimonies of* Phœnicians. *Other things that recommended the* Jewish Scriptures *to the esteem of the* Learned Heathens *of that Age. Several Eminent* Jewish *Writers who, by* Mystical *Expositions, brought their own Doctrines near the received* System *of the* Dogmatical Philosophers, §. XXX. Heathen Oracles, *in favour of the* Jews *owned for genuine by the* Heathens *themselves. The good Characters of* Abraham *and* Moses *in the received* Orphaicks. Joseph *and* Moses *taken for* Ægyptian Priests, §. XXXI. *A Set of* Philosophers, *several of them* Antienter *than* Philo Byblius, *who received the Authority of* Moses *as a Wise* Legislator *and a* Prophet, *and mentioned him with respect.* Chalcidius *a* Heathen, §. XXXII. *The* Jewish Κοσμογονία *taken*

*into the counterfeited Works of* Hermes, *about the time of* Philo Byblius, §. XXXIII. *How this might come to pass*, §. XXXIV. Philo Byblius's *Partiality appears in his making* Sanchoniathon *prefer his own City* Byblos *before all the Cities of* Phœnicia *for Antiquity, even before* Berytus *it self. Why he makes his* Sanchoniathon *enquire into the* Archives *of the* particular Cities, §. XXXV. *He had, in this Work, a particular design upon the* Jews. *Why he makes his* Sanchoniathon *live in the time of* Abibalus, §. XXXVI. *The time of* Sanchoniathon *fixed, not by the Age of* Semiramis, *but of* Abibalus. *His time, by the* Tyrian Records, *either* Equal, *or a little* before *the War of* Troy, §. XXXVII. *Why he was to Father his* Informations, *concerning* Jewish *Matters, on a* Jew *and a* Priest, §. XXXVIII. *Why on a Priest of the* God Jevo, *and on* Gedeon *particularly. How he might from his* Name *collect his being a* Priest. Hierombaal, ירעי *and* גרעי, §. XXXIX. *Why he was to begin with a* Κοσμογονία. *All Books concerning* Ægyptian Notions *Fathered on* Hermes. *The Fashion of Fathering all* latter *Inventions of a* Sect *on the* First Author *of it, especially in their* Dialogues, §. XL. *The* Ægyptian Philosophy *followed by* Sanchoniathon

niathon. *How he ſecured himſelf from ſuſpicion of miſtake in* Interpreting Mercury. *How the* Greeks *came to be miſtaken*, §. XLI. *How the* Ægyptians. φυτσμὸς. Ἀπόκρυφα γεάμματα, §. XLII. *How* Philo Byblius *ſecures his* Sanchoniathon *from the Suſpicion of* Fabling, *and* what Fables *he means*, §. XLIII, XLIV. *Yet he forgot himſelf and Fathered a* Scandalous Fable *upon him*, §. XLV. *The Name of* Sanchoniathon *perhaps borrowed from the Famous* Ægyptian Sonchis. *The* Atlantick Theology *probably the ſame with that of* Mercury, §. XLVI. *Recapitulation*, §. XLVII. *The* Scripture *needs no Confirmation from* Heathen *Authors*, §. XLVIII.

# A DISCOURSE, Concerning *SANCHONIATHON*'s *Phœnician* Hiſtory.

*In Euſeb. Præp. Evang. l.* 1. *ch.* 10.

§. I. HAVING in the latter of theſe Letters intimated ſome ſuſpicion concerning the genuineneſs of *Sanchoniathon*, and conſidering how generally Learned men receive and quote him for an Author of that Antiquity he pretends to; as it will become me to purge my ſelf from the ſuſpicion of *Heterodoxy*, ſo I believe it will not be ingrateful to the ingenious inquiſite Reader to underſtand what may be ſaid concerning him. Which I ſhall do from ſome Letters which paſſed between me and a Learned Friend concerning him before the Publication of theſe *Letters* of *Advice*, and which, were in truth, the Reaſons of my paſſing that cenſure upon him. N. IX. Dr. *Thomas Smith* Fellow of *Magdalen* Colledge in *Oxford*.

§. II. THE *Credit* of this Author does the rather deſerve an accurate and impartial Examination, becauſe of the great uſe which is made of him in clearing ſeveral

ral *Historical* and *Philosophical* passages of the *Old Testament*; and because he is generally taken for the *Faithfullest*, and *Antientest*, and consequently the most *useful Heathen Author* that was extant within the Memory of Learned Ages. Which might make all who either have formerly, or do still believe him so, think nothing too difficult to be confirmed by his Credit.

(*) His very *Name* was observed to signifie φιλαλήθης, which if it were given him by his *Contemporaries*, must needs have been a great attestation of his *Integrity* from them who had best reason to know him.* As for his *Age*, he is pretended equal to *Abibalus*, to whom he is said to have Dedicated this his *Phœnician History*, that *Abibalus*, I mean who, by the *Phœnician*

(*) So *Theodoret. Therap.* II. Σαγχωνιάθων, ὁ κατὰ τὴν Φοινίκων διάλεκτον φιλαλήθης, &c. And so his *Translator*. But I had rather correct him from *Eusebius* whom he Transcribes; who, in two places where he has occasion to cite this same passage, agrees with *himself*, and yet differs from *Theodoret*. So therefore he: Σαγχωνιάθων, ὁ κατὰ τὴν Φοινίκων φιλαλήθως, &c. Συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγεγράφας. Reading φιλαλήθως for φιλαλήθης; and opposing *Sanchoniathon*'s writing in the *Phœnician* to the *Greek* Translation of him by *Philo Byblius*, and referring φιλαλήθως to what follows συναγαγὼν καὶ συγγεγράφας not to *Sanchoniathon* mentioned before. *Pr. Ev. l.* 10. *X.* 91. And then there will appear no footsteps of any *Etymology* of his Name. Yet *Bochart* gives a likely *Etimology* for that purpose, which, if it hold, will shew, at least, a design of *Philo Byblius* in giving him that particular Name. * *Euseb. Pr. Ev. l.* 10. 31. A. X. 9. 485. *Theodoret Therap.* II.

Records,

Records, is ſuppoſed to be the Father of *Hieromenus* or *Eiromus*, conceived to be the ſame with *Hiram*, contemporary with *David* and *Solomon* as appears, not only from the *Scriptures*, but alſo from the ſame *Phœnician* Records, on whoſe credit, no doubt, it is that *Joſephus* makes the Eleventh year compleat, or Twelfth begun of *Hiram*, to concur with the Fourth of *Solomon*, wherein the Temple was built. For he had the ſum of thoſe Records Collected to his hand by *Menander Epheſius* and *Dius* and *Hieronymus Tyrius*, and others, without whoſe aſſiſtance he could not have been ſo particular in fixing the certain year of *Hiram*. The Learned *Bochart* would have this *Abibalus* King of *Berytus* diſtinct from him who was King of *Tyre*, and *Antienter*. But if the account hold which we ſhall afterwards give from the *Phœnician* Records, to ſhew him to have been *Equal* or a *little Ancienter* than the War of *Troy*, (exactly as this *Abibalus* the Father of *Hiram* is placed by them who mention him) it will then appear that no other was meant than the Father of *Hiram*. That he is called King of the *Bertyans*, was for no other end but to ſignifie that he was *Sanchoniathon's*

XI° *Hirami*, Ant. vii[i]. 2. p. 259. Ed. *Gene*. xii°. c. *App*. l. 1. p. 1043.

Vid. *Joſeph*. Ant. viii. 2. Cont. *Appion*. L. 1. *Theoph. Antioch*. L. iii. ad *Autclyc*.

*choniathon*'s Prince who was of *Berytus*, exactly as *Sanchoniathon* himself is in *Athenæus* and *Suidas* made a *Tyrian*, because his *Berytus* was, in his time, under the Jurisdiction of *Tyre*, which is again another probability that his *Abibalus* was the same with the K. of *Tyre*. *Porphyry* himself who first produced this *Sanchoniathon* against the *Christians*, makes him equal to *Semiramis*, who as he tells us in *Eusebius*'s *Preparation*, was either before or equal to the Wars of *Troy*; but he is confuted by *Eusebius* who makes her Eight hundred and fifty years earlier then that same War. Her Husband *Ninus* is generally, by *Heathen* Authors, made the utmost Period of all Histories they were acquainted with, who yet mention many things Antienter than that War of *Troy*. But this matter is excellently accounted for by the Learned and Judicious Sir *John Marsham*, who shews that *Porphyry* herein followed the more likely account of *Herodotus*, though *Ctesias*'s larger account had the luck to be more received. *Dioces* (the First King of the *Medes* after their revolt from the *Assyrians* according to *Herodotus*,) began his Reign *Olymp.* 17. 4. according to *Eusebius*. The *whole time* of the *Assyrians* was Five hundred and Twenty years ac-

Pr. Eu. l. 9. p. 31. B.

*Chron.* L. 11. init.

*Tertul.* de Pal. c. 2. ubi *Salmas.* & a *Cerda.*

*Eus.* Pr. Ev. x. 9. p. 485. 486.

*Macrob.* in somn. scip 11. 19.

*Oros.* L. 1.

Chron. Can. Æ. gypt. Sec. xvii. p. 522. Edit. *Lip.*

*Eus.* Chron.

*Herodo.* L. 1 c.

cording to *Herodotus*. If therefore we reckon backward from that Fourth year of the Seventeenth *Olympiad*, the time of *Semiramis* who ſucceeded her Husband *Ninus*, will fall out much about the time where *Porphyry* places it. Nor was *Porphyry* alone, though he had indeed few Companions, in following *Herodotus*. He ſhews that *Appian* did ſo too, and the moſt Judicious *Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus*, and *Joſephus*. And, which is more particularly obſervable to our preſent purpoſe, *Philo Byblius* alſo agrees with him in placing *Semiramis* later then uſually, whom he makes Two thouſand years *later* than the Building of *Babylon*. Beſides the *Authenticalneſs* of the Records, from whence he derived his Information, is extremely conſiderable (if it ſhould prove really what it is pretended) the Sacred Writings of *Taautus*, that is *Mercury*, (of whom there is ſo much mention in thoſe yet earlier *Times*, of which he wrote his Hiſtory) the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμωνίων γεγράμματα. *Euſ. Pr. Ev.* l. 9. 32. B. the Ὑπομνήματα of *Hierombaal* Prieſt of the God *Jevo. ib.* p. 31. the Ὑπομνήματα of their Cities, and the Ἀναγραφαὶ of their Temples, *Ib.* But as ſo great Recommendations of *Fidelity*, of *Antiquity*, and ſufficient means of *Information*

*Appian*, Præf. *Dion. Halicarn.* L. 1. *Philo* ap. *Steph. Byz.*

*Philo Byblius* ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. 31. D.

*mation*, must needs make him very useful for the Discovery of many and momentous *Truths*, if justly challenged; so, on the contrary, must they make his Authority very mischievous for seducing those who trust it, into numerous and dangerous *Errors*, if they should after all be found *False* and *Groundless*. Let us see therefore, whether these challenges be as *just* as they are specious and *plausible*

§. III. AND here I consider First, that all these Arguments of his Credibility depend, as to Us, either on the pure Testimony of *Porphyry*, who was the first who produced him with any great applause and confidence, and who is therefore justly suspicious, if not of wholly coyning him, yet at least of a partial favour to him, and of the first endeavours to justifie and defend him after the neglects that had been cast upon him since the time that he had first been Published and Translated by *Philo Byblius*, or else of *Philo Byblius* himself. *Athenæus* is the only Author extant that quoted him, that we know of, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*, supposing that the Σοφιστὴς, whose *Phœnician* Antiquities are quoted by him, and joyned with *Mochus* another very Antient *Phœnician* Writer often taken notice of, were

*Athen.* Deipnos. L. 3.

the

he ſame with our *Sanchoniathon*, as he is commonly conceived to be, and I believe, not improbably, though he in *Athenæus* was a *Tyrian*, ours a *Berytian*, a difference not very difficultly reconcileable, as has been ſhewn. If it ſhould prove otherwiſe, then *Porphyry* alone muſt anſwer for both, not only the pretended *Sanchoniathon* himſelf, but the pretended *Greek* Tranſlation alſo of him by *Philo Byblius*. But to allow him all the favour that is reaſonable, and to grant that this *Philo Byblius* is to be ſuſpected of the Original fraud, becauſe of this more Antient citation of him by *Athenæus*, which could have been from none but *Philo Byblius*; yet *Porphyry* muſt needs be looked on as the *retriever* of a *neglected*, and therefore *ſuſpicious* Author, who muſt have been by that time very Famous, if he had been thought genuine, which is very conſiderable for my preſent purpoſe.

§. IV. FOR I conſider further, that as the Principles both of the *Pythagoreans* and *Platoniſts* (who were both of them admired by *Porphyry* allowed the Lawfulneſs of *Medicial* falſehoods, as they called them which was no doubt the Original firſt of thoſe *Mythological* Stories

For the *Pythagoreans*, ſee *Tim.* Locr. περ. φύσ. κόσμ. For the *Platoniſts*, *Plato* himſelf *de Rep.* L. 3. v. S. *Hieronym.* adv. *Ruff.* L. 1.

with

with which they first beautified their *Dialogues*, then of all those *Forgeries* which were afterwards introduced by the *Monks*, who from their first Institution were of a *Philosophical* Extraction and Genius; I say besides these *Principles* which may let us see that it was *possible* he *might* deal disingenuously with us; the *occasion* of his first producing him, and his *design*, were such as may make him further suspicious of using the utmost liberty of his Principles *actually*. For it was purposely to confront the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures*, and in that very work which was designed to overthrow the Credit of *Christianity*. The like I shall (*) hereafter observe concerning *Philo Byblius*.

See the words of *Porphyry* in *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. X. 9. *Theodoret* Therap. 11.

* §. 36.

§. V. BUT that I may not therefore conclude him guilty of a disingenuous *Fact*, only because it was agreeable, not only to *Principles*, but his *Design*, and *Interest*; Let us consider the thing it self, and see whether it be likely that either *Sanchoniathon*, or his Translator *Philo Byblius*, were ever had in any esteem till *Porphyry* vouched for them. If they were, how comes it to pass that none but *Athenæus* should take notice of an Author so extreamly

treamly valuable, if he had been genuine! How comes it to pass, that those few *Christians* that mention him afterwards should quote him only at the *Second hand* from *Eusebius*, or at the uttermost from *Porphyry*? Why had they not rather recourse to *Philo Byblius* himself, if he had been common? And what imaginable reason is there why he should not have been *Common*, especially in those Eastern parts so near *Phœnicia*, if he had been valued, or thought genuine? Yet (a) *Theodoret* it seems had never seen him, but only in *Eusebius*. (b) St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* was so far from quoting what he had occasion to produce out of him from the Original of *Philo Byblius*, as that his memory, on which he seems to have quoted him from *Eusebius*, betrayed him into several and great mistakes. He first pretends to have had what he says concerning him from *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Stromatæ*. A plain sign he had not seen *Philo Byblius* himself. Yet who can doubt but that he also mistook *Clemens Alexandrinus* for *Eusebius*? It is certain there is no mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Translator* in the *Stromatæ* of *Clemens* as we have them extant at present. Was it therefore in what is lost? There are but two imperfections

(a) *Therap.* II. III. from *Euſ.* Pr.Ev.x.9.
(b) Cont. *Julian.*l.vi.

fections in the whole Work, the beginning of the *First* Book, and the *Eighth*. What was wanting in the beginning of the *First Book*, we know by what remains to have been nothing but Introduction, where he had yet no occasion of medling with the *Antiquity* of *Phœnician* Writers. Not in the *Eighth Book*, where by what he promises in the *Sixth*, we know he designed to answer the Heathens concerning the *Coming of our Lord*, that is, I suppose, concerning his *coming so lately*, and in so *mean appearance* (which were the Popular Objections of that Age) or else concerning his *Second coming* to Judge *Persecutors* and *Unbelievers*, which ordinarily concluded their *Controversial Writings*. So the Sacred Writers of the *New Testament* frequently. So St. *Cyprian*'s Second Book of *Testimonies*, *ad Quirin.* which seems to have been the *last* of that Work. So *Irenæus* in the last Chapters *adv. Hær.* So *Lactantius Lib. VII. Div. Inst.* *Phil. Commodianus* is more particularly large on this Argument. But neither of these could afford him any occasion of mentioning this Author. For none can doubt but what now, and in *Photius*'s time, possessed the place of the *Eighth* Book had no affinity with the Argument

*Strom.* VI. p. 617. A.

Cod. cxi.

of

of this Work. And yet neither is there any mention of *Sanchoniathon* or his *Tranſlator*. But to put the matter out of doubt that this was only a miſtake of St. *Cyril*, as I ſaid; where *Clemens* had indeed occaſion to diſpute the Queſtion of *Antiquity* between the *Heathen* and the *Sacred* Writers, there he has not the leaſt intimation of either of them; and the very words quoted by St. *Cyril* are exactly in *Euſebius*, but not as out of the Text of *Sanchoniathon*, but the *Preface* of *Philo Byblius*. Which he could not ſo eaſily have confounded if he had uſed the Book it ſelf; but might very probably in borrowing them from *Euſebius*, who compriſes all he or *Porphyry* had collected both out of the *Text* and the *Preface*, in the ſame Chapters immediately following each other. Beſides *Porphyry* reckons but Eight Books of *Sanchoniathon de Abſt.* II. n. 56. but *Euſebius* Nine, reckoning it ſeems the very Preface of *Philo* for a diſtinct Book. Which being quoted for *Sanchoniathon*'s by *Cyril*, ſhews that he follows the very diviſion of *Euſebius*, and therefore took what he had from him.

*Strom.* I.

Pr. Ev. l. 9.

*Bochart* conceives the *Phyſiology* or *Theogony* to have been a diſtinct Book from the Hiſtory. But ſee what is ſaid hereafter.

§. VI. BUT what is it he pretends to tell us from *Clemens Alexandrinus*? That

*Sanchoniathon*'s Book was Tranſlated by *Joſephus*. But who ever mentions ſuch a *Tranſlation* amongſt the Works of *Joſephus*? How is it credible that he ſhould ſo far favour the cauſe of the *Phœnicians* who ſo profeſſedly maintains the greater *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* againſt them in his Books againſt *Appion*? And who can reconcile this pretended Teſtimony from *Clemens* with *Porphyry*, who certainly, if any, converſed with the Original Tranſlation? If he be to be credited, here are again two great miſtakes of St. *Cyril*, Firſt his miſtaking *Philo Byblius* for the famous *Alexandrian Philo* the *Jew*; then his confounding that *Philo* with *Joſephus* who was of the ſame Nation. Which again plainly ſhew, that he quoted him by *memory*, and at the *Second hand*.

§. VII. BUT beſides that this *ſilence*, or *Second hand* Quotations, even *after* the time he was divulged and applauded by *Porphyry*, are ſtrong ſuſpicions that he was either not known, or not regarded, (either of which are equally ſerviceable to my purpoſe;) yet further, what ſhould be the reaſon that ſo uſeful and Antient an Author ſhould be ſo little known even *before* the time of *Porphyry*? Was it becauſe he was locked up in the *Phœnician* Tongue

Tongue? But why ſhould he not at leaſt, have been better known after the *Greek* Tranſlation of him by *Philo Byblius*? Yet even then ſo little was he known that, were it not for the forementioned Teſtimony of *Athenæus*, we might juſtly doubt whether ſuch a Tranſlation was ever undertaken by that *Philo*. *Suïdas* mentions this *Philo*, and reckons up others of his Works, and fixes his time. He places him near the Reign of *Nero*, and makes him Threeſcore and Eighteen Years old, at the Conſulſhip of *Severus Herennius* in *Olymp.* 220. Which if it be true muſt fall at leaſt about the Reign of *Trajan*, though no ſuch Conſulſhip appear in our preſent *Fact*, poſſibly becauſe he might have been either a *Suffectus*, or expunged out of the publick *Faſti* for ſome Crime. Nay, he expreſly makes him to have written concerning the Reign of *Hadrian*. And therefore, in all likelyhood the broken number of the odd *Olympiads* above Two Hundred and Twenty is wanting in *Suidas*. But what ground *Scaliger* had to fix the Year of the 229. *Olymp.* I do not underſtand. Yet no ſuch Tranſlation appears in that Catalogue of his Works, unleſs it were contained under the Ἄλλα.

*Voce* Φίλων.

*Scaliger*, in ὀλυμπιάδ. συναγωγ.

§. VIII. AND why ſhould he never have been mentioned by thoſe antient *Apologiſts* for the *Chriſtian* Religion who wrote before *Porphyry*? They had a juſt occaſion for it in that great Diſpute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Scriptures* above all *Heathen* Authors. On this occaſion they drew up Catalogues of the Antienteſt *Heathen* Authors they knew of, yet *Sanchoniathon*, the moſt appoſite Inſtance of them all, never being ſo much as thought of. Not by *Juſtin Martyr* in the time of *Antoninus Pius*, though he was a *Samaritan*, and had thereby the opportunity to have known the famous Writers of his Neighbouring *Phœnicians*, nay to have underſtood them though they had not been Tranſlated to his hand. Yet he knew of nothing *Antient* either amongſt the *Greeks* or the *Barbarians*. Which how could he have ſaid if he had known any thing of this moſt Antient *Sanchoniathon*? Not by *Theophilus Antiochenus* in the time of *Verus*, with whom he ends his Chronology, though he were nearer the *Phœnicians* than the *Græcians*, nay and had ſpecial occaſion in mentioning the *Phœnician* Antiquities. Not by *Tatianus* the Scholar of St. *Juſtin*, and ſo not long, if at all, after him, when he wrote his *Oration*

Οὐδ' ἐστὶ τί σύγγραμμα παλαιὸν, Ἑλλήνων ἢ Βαρβάρων σημαῖνον πρᾶξιν. *Juſt.* Mart. Paræn. p. 13. Ad Autolyc. L. III.

*tion* againſt the *Greeks* (it does not appear that St. *Juſtin* was then dead, though I know how *Tatianus* is miſtaken by *Euſebius*, who has alſo generally deceived the Learned who have followed him) though he was an *Aſſyrian*, and takes particular notice of the Antienteſt *Græcian* and *Phœnician* Authors, and names all the moſt Antient *Phœnicians* that he knew of, which were but Three, *Theodotus*, *Mochus* and *Hypſicrates*. Not by *Clemens* as has already been obſerved, who deduces his computation to the death of *Commodus*, though he alſo had occaſion, in diſputing that ſame Controverſie concerning the Age of the moſt Antient Heathen Writers. I think St. *Cyril*'s miſtake concerning him, has been ſufficiently diſcovered and convicted. Not by *Tertullian* in the times of *Severus* and *Caracalla*, though he had alſo the like occaſion given him in his *Apology*. Not by *Origen*, though he refers to *Joſephus* againſt *Appion*, and *Tatianus* for a Collection of ſuch *Phœnician* Authors as had mentioned any thing concerning *Jewiſh* Affairs; nay mentions *Herennius Philo* who had written concerning the

*Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt.* IV. 16. He only ſays that *Creſcens* had endeavoured the death of St. *Juſtin* (πραγματευθεὶς is his Word) but he has not the leaſt intimation that it was in his power to accompliſh it. What he ſays was only taken from *Juſtins* own words in his *Apology*. *Or.* adv. *Græs.* p. 171. & ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. X. 2. p. 493. *Strom.* 1.

Apolog. c. 19.

C. *Celſ.* lib. 1. p. 13, 14.

*Jews*, if this be the *Philo* to whom the Translation of *Sanchoniathon* is ascribed by *Porphyry*, as in all likelyhood he is the *Philo* mentioned by *Suidas*, who had said of himself that his Sir-name was *Herennius*. And the Title of *Herennius Philo* is given him in the Inscription of a *M. S.* Work of his on *Aristotles Metaphysicks*, now in the Library of the most accomplished and truly Great Dr. *Isaac Vossius*. And my very Dear and very Learned Friend Dr. *Lloyd* conceives that he might have borrowed that Sir-name of *Herennius* from his Patron *Herennius Severus* the Consul, which was usually for *Liberti* to * do in those times; and that the Consul was the same with him mentioned in *Pliny*, *Ep. Lib.* iv. 28. who there appears to have been a Lover of Learning, and himself a very Learned Person. The Times do very well agree; and it is not otherwise easie to conceive how *Philo* a *Phœnician* should come by a *Roman* Name. And that he was very intimate with that Consul appears both by his dating his own Age by his

*When they were made *Liberti* they were not only made *Romans*, but taken into the *Families* of their *Patrons*, as appears from the *Inscriptions* of their *Family Sepulchres*, which were generally conceived in that Form, *FILIIS ET FILIABUS, LIBERTIS ET LIBERTABUS POSTERISQUE EORUM.* And then how proper was it for them to receive the *Gentile* name of their *Patrons Family?*

his *Patrons Conſulſhip* and by his bringing *Hermippus* his Country-man and Scholar acquainted with him. Yet even on this occaſion, *Origen* makes no mention of his *Sanchoniathon* among thoſe *Phœnician* Writers which he immediately refers to as mentioning *Jewiſh* Affairs. How could he have ſlipt ſuch an opportunity as this was, of mentioning him, if he had known him? Not even by *Celſus* himſelf, whom *Origen* places under *Hadrian*, though he muſt certainly have lived later if he be the ſame to whom *Lucian* dedicated his *Pſeudomantis* after the death of *Marcus Antoninus* whom he calls Θεὸς, nay muſt have written this very Work againſt the *Chriſtians* later than *Hadrian*, for (1) *Marcellina* and (2) *Marcion*, both of them mentioned by him, as they firſt broached their *Hereſies* under *Anicetus*, ſo moſt probably after the death of *Hadrian*. *Philo* was as his work mentioned by *Origen* ſhews him, ſufficiently diſaffected to the *Jews*, ſo that if he did Tranſlate any ſuch work of *Sanchoniathon*, he would moſt probably have deſigned it as *Porphyry*, to confront the Antiquity of the *Jews*. And how greedily would *Celſus* have ſeconded him if he had known of any ſuch work Publiſhed by him? Thus it appears that this

See *Suid.* in Ἑρμιππ.

(1) ap. *Orig.* L. v. p. 272
(2) ap. *Orig.* L. vi. p. 326. & ubi ſupra.

this *Sanchoniathon* was either generally not known, or (which amounts to the ſame thing) generally neglected by all ſorts of Authors, both *Chriſtians* and *Heathens* too, from the time of *Philo Byblius* to *Porphyry*.

§. IX. BUT to aſcend yet higher, what ſhould hinder him from being known even before *Philo Byblius*, if he had been what he is pretended? It is true, he could neither have been known nor deſervedly valued by the *Greeks* till he was Tranſlated. But what imaginable cauſe is there why he was not Tranſlated more Antiently? The *Phœnician Records*, and *Hiſtories* had been ſearched and tranſlated and divulged by *Hieronymus Tyrius*, *Menander Epheſius* and *Dius*, *Heſtiæus* and *Philoſtratus* and others; nay the very Original Records themſelves are quoted by *Joſephus*, and the Original Copies of the Epiſtles between *Solomon* and *Hiram* are ſtill mentioned as extant in their *Archives* by the ſame *Joſephus* and *Theophilus Antiochenus*. How comes it to paſs they ſhould all of them overlook this moſt conſiderable, moſt creditable Author? Why ſhould they omit this moſt Antient account of their moſt Antient Times, when the great deſign of all theſe Enquiries ſeems to have been

Vid. *Bochart.* Chanaan L. II. c. 17. *Joſeph.* Ant. viii. 2. c. *Appion.* L. I.

*Theoph. Ant.* L. III. ad *Autolyc.*

en a General Diſpute concerning the oſt Antient Nations? Why did they not ranſlate him then? Why did they not, leaſt, take out of him, and vouch him r their Authority? Had they done ſo, hy ſhould not *Joſephus* have had re-ourſe to him, if not in his *Phœnician* Original, yet at leaſt as to thoſe particu-rs they had borrowed from him? Why oes he never mention him either in his *ntiquities*, or his Books againſt *Appion*, ſpecially in thoſe things which he relates oncerning *Abraham*, which he was parti- Ant. l. 8. ularly careful to confirm by the beſt Te-imonies he knew of.

§. X. *Sanchoniathon* had been uſeful ven to thoſe who had enquired only for heir *Hiſtories*. But conſider we him fur-her as a *Philoſopher*; for ſuch the Writers of he Θεογονίαι and eſpecially of the Κοσμογονίαι hereof much of *Sanchoniathon*'s Work conſiſted, were then reputed, that being he uſual *Myſtical* way whereby they oncealed the ſecrets of their *Natural Philoſophy*. So alſo *Suidas* Σαγχωνιάθων. ίος Φιλόσοφ. Indeed the θεολογία ſeems o have been the ſame with the Κοσμογονία. or what *Euſebius* had called the θεολογία f the *Phœnicians Pr. Ev. l.* 9. that he calls heir Κοσμογονία *c.* 10. To which he adds the

Ζωογονία

Ζωογονία also for compleating it. For both these were pretended to be taken from the Κοσμογονία of *Taautus*. Yet even so, there were several fair occasions of discovering and Translating him, Antienter than *Philo*. For their Antientest *Philosophers* had been also enquired into long before *Philo*. What was *Pythagoras*'s design in Travelling amongst them? Was it only to see their Countries and their Fashions? Was it not rather to acquaint himself with their *Philosophical* Improvements? And would he, who is so much celebrated for his Conversation with the *Phœnician Prophets*, the Posterity of *Mochus*, not rather have employed his time in inquiring after this equally, if not more, Antient both *Historian* and *Philosopher Sanchoniathon*? After the *Macedonian* Conquests had opened an access for the *Greek Philosophers* to the *Phœnician Archives*; they then Translated as many as were valued by them. *Theodotus* and *Hypsicrates* and *Mochus* were Translated by *Asitus* or *Chetus* as *Tatianus* tells us; and the same concerning *Mochus* and many others appear from *Strabo*. How comes *Sanchoniathon*, if there had then been any such Author extant, to have escaped their diligence?

*Iamblich.* de vita *Pythag.*

Orat. adv. *Græc. Chætus*. But *Asitus* is a fragment of the Oration, as quoted by *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. X. 11. But *Bochart* corrects it *Lætus*, and rightly *Geogr. Lib.* XVI.

§. XI. He

§. XI. HE pretends to have had his Information from the Writings of *Taautus*, from the *Myſtical* Books of the *Ammonians*, and the Ὑπομνήματα or *Memoires* of *Jerombaal*, the *Prieſt* of the God *Jevo*, the Ὑπομνήματα of the *particular Cities* and the Ἀναγραφαὶ of their *Temples*. Things very conſiderable indeed, if they had been truly pretended to. But let us ſee whether there be any reaſon to believe them on his credit. It was indeed a very Ancient way of preſerving knowledge to inſcribe what they would preſerve in *Pillars* to be kept in the *Temples* of their moſt Eminent Gods, the better to be ſecured from *Weather* and the *Violence* of Prophane hands. Thus they did with their *Laws*, with their *Leagues* and *Covenants*, with their *Hiſtories*, and their *Arts* and *Sciences*. Inſtances might have been given of all theſe ſorts, if I had thought it neceſſary. Particularly, for *Hiſtories* there was that of *Euemerus* from the *Inſcriptions* in the *Temple* of *Jupiter Triphylius*; for *Arts*, thoſe from whence *Calliſthenes* gave *Ariſtotle* an account of the *Eclipſes* obſerved by the *Chaldæans*, thoſe of the ſame *Babylonians* referred to by *Epigenes*, *Beroſus* and *Critodemus*, and the Famous

Vid. *Plutarch* de Iſid. & Oſirid. *Lactant.* Div. Inſt. L. 11.

Ap. *Simpl.* in *Ariſt.* de Cælo. L. 11. Com. 16.

*Plin.* Nat. Hiſt. vii. 56.

ous *Pillars* of *Seth* mentioned by *Jo*
*phus*. Out of ſuch *Pillars* as theſe
doubt the Publiſher of *Sanchoniath*
would have us believe his Hiſtory to ha
been gathered. Nor was it unuſual fo
*Plutarch.* de *Iſid.* & *Oſirid.* p. 360. *Deceivers* to impoſe on the World on th
credit of ſuch *Pillars*. *Euemerus* no
mentioned was looked on by Antiquit
as a Famous inſtance of it. For it wa
certainly the eaſieſt way for broachin
Falſe-hoods. Theſe were *Monument*
which could be produced on the *ſudde*
concerning the moſt *remote* Antiquitie
without the atteſtation of Antient *Wri*
*tings*, becauſe themſelves were ſuppoſe
to be *Originals* of the times they pretend
ed to give account of; were ſuppoſe
remote from Vulgar *Knowledge* or *under*
*ſtanding*, being either kept in the *Adyta*
or locked up in ſome abſolute unknown
*Character*, which none but the *Learne*
and the *Prieſts* could underſtand; were
contrived in *Hieroglyphicks* or ſuch *ambi*
*guous* notes as were capable of what *In*
*terpretation* thoſe deſigning Perſons who
produced them were pleaſed to put upon
them; depended generally on *Oral Tra*
*dition*, than which there is not a more
unfaithful *Conveyer* of Monuments to *Po*
*ſterity*; depended wholly on the credit of
the

*Prieſts*, being withal generally inte-
ſted in the things thus preſerved, making
r the *credit* of their falſe *Religion*, or
*credit* of their *Nation*, for *Antiquity*,
rare *Inventions*; were to be found and
amined only in *one place* (not like *Books*
ery where) nor even there it ſelf with-
t the Leave and Directions of ſuch in-
reſted *Prieſts*. Upon this account their
ry *humoured* Stories with which it was
ſhionable in thoſe times to adorn their
*logues*, were grounded on the credit
ſuch pretended *Inſcriptions*. So *Cebes's*
*ble*, and the *Samothracian Inſcriptions*
ferred to by *Axiochus*, and thoſe con-
ning the *Atlantides* in *Timæus*.

§. XII. AND thus it was generally in
diſingenuous dealings of thoſe Nati-
, which upon the appearing of the
*riſh* Scriptures in the common Tongue,
an to rival them, and one another for
*iquity*. Thus the *Babylonians* in *De-*
*critus* preſerved their *Moral Diſcourſes*
the *Pillars* of *Acicarus*. Thus *Xiſu-*
*s* in *Beroſus* is ſaid to have preſerved
*Chaldæan* Inventions Ingraven in
*tes* from the Deluge. Thus *Manetho*
tended to have gathered his new *Dy-*
*ties* from the like *Pillars* of *Mercury*.
*Cham* is pretended to have preſerved
his

*Clem Alex.* Strom. 1. p. 303.

*Euſeb.* Gr. p. 6.

*Caſſian.* Coll. viii. 21.

his inventions in *Judicial Astrology* by the like invention of Ingraving them in Plates, which Plates they usually fastned to *Pillars*; from whence I am apt to think that the *Gnosticks* might take occasion to forge that *Prophecy* which was among them obtruded in those times under his Name. And as *Ægyptian* Notions were the Principal ingredient in most of those Antient *Heresies* that were comprehended under the common Name of *Gnosticks*, so I am apt to think that *Chemi* the Antient Name of *Ægypt* gave them occasion to father what they pleased on a Scripture-Patriarch of a Name that had some affinity to it, besides that the *Scripture* it self calls *Ægypt* so often the Land of *Ham*, so that the Inscriptions of *Cham* and *Mercury* were probably the very same. The like also conceive concerning the *Pillars* of *Seth* aforementioned from *Josephus*. Nor is the mistake so difficult as may be imagined. It is very well known that the *Dog-star* was by the *Ægyptians* called (1) *Sothis*; That the revolution of their *great year* was accordingly from it called *Sothiaca* (2) *Periodus*, because the *Dog-star* then returned exactly to the very same place where he had been before. That their *great year* was therefore called

*Clem. Alexandrin.* Strom. VI. p. 642. A.

*Plutarch.* de *Isid.* & *Osirid.*

(1) *Horus Apoll.* c. 3. *Plutarch.* de *Isid.* & *Osi. Chalcidius, in Pla. Timæum* malè σολεχὴ. *Porphyr.* de antr. Nymphar.

(2) *Clem. Alexand.* Strom. I. p. 335. C.

κυνικὸς or *Canicularis*, as *Cenſorinus* tells us, becauſe it began exactly on the firſt day of that Month on which the *Dog-ſtar* roſe, which was the *Ægyptian Thoth*. Who ſees not that the whole contrivance of that Year was exactly fitted to the courſe of that *Star*? And that therefore *Thoth* was reckoned for the firſt Month in the Year becauſe the *Dog-ſtar* roſe in it? If therefore its Name were given it with any deſign, it ſeems to have been therefore called *Thoth* becauſe their *Sothis* roſe in it, and therefore that thoſe two Names are indeed deſigned for the ſame. Nor is the change of *S* and *Th* either difficult or unuſual in thoſe Tongues, as might have been ſhewn by multitudes of Examples if I had leiſure. De die nat. c. 18.

§. XIII. BUT whether the Name of *Thoth* and *Sothis* were Originally the ſame or not; yet it ſeems clear that the Notions of *Mercury* were inſcribed to *Sothis*. So *Manetho*'s *Sacred Hiſtory* (in the ſame Senſe no doubt, that *Ennius*'s Tranſlation of *Euemerus*'s Hiſtory, pretended alſo from *Sacred Pillars* was alſo called *Sacred*) is called the Βίβλος Σώθεως in *Euſeb. ib.* And, which yet comes more fully home to what I am now proving, the very Name Σὼθ is uſed in this matter Lactant. Div. Inſt. L. 1. c. 11.

from *Petosiris* an *Ægyptian* Writer, by *Vettius Valens*, *Antiochenus* in *Scaliger* and others, and that in the *Masculine Gender*. But this whole matter will be yet plainer if we remember that the design of *Manetho* (1) was to fit his *Chronology* to that *Sothiac Period*. We see it accordingly prevailed in most of the later *Ægyptian Chronologies*, which pretended to any more than ordinary *Exactness*. So the *Destruction* of *Troy* is noted in *Clem.* (2) *Alexandrinus*, most probably from an *Egyptian* Author. So were the years of *Nabonassar* in *Ptolomies Canon*, and the *Babylonian Eclipses* fitted to the same *Canicular year* by (3) *Hipparchus*. Now this *Sothiac Period* was purposely invented to give a full and exact account of the *Suns* course, till he was to rise exactly in the same place of the *Zodiac* where he had risen before. For proceeding on this *Hypothesis* that the true *Solar Year* consisted of 365 days and $\frac{1}{4}$, this Fourth was not intercalated every Fourth Year, as in the *Julian* account, but permitted to run on (purposely that their Festivities might pass through the whole Year) till those Fourth parts of a *Day* made up a whole *Year*, which they did in 1461. *Egyptian*, equivalent to 1460. *Julian* Years. That this was purposely designed

In loc *Eus.* Chr. Græc. p. 6.

(1) So *Concharis* is reckoned in the xvi. *Dynasty* τῆς Κυνικῆς λεγομένης Κύκλος πρὸς τῶν Μακεδόνων. *Syncell.* p. 103. C.

(2) *Strom.* I.

(3) *Ptol.* L. iv. c. ult. p. 104.

designed to signifie the Course of the *Sun*, appears from their calling the whole Period by the Name of (*) *Annus* Ἡλιακὸς, and ὁ Θεοῦ ἐνιαυτὸς, as the Name of Θεὸς simply taken, signifies the *Sun* in *Antient Authors*. But the *Sun*, whose Course this was, was called *Typhon*, as *Typhon* was also called *Seth*, as *Plutarch* (*) assures us. Accordingly as most of the *Egyptian* Names of *Persons* and *Places* were taken from their *Gods*, so we have still footsteps of this *Gods* name in the *Names* of *Sethron*, *Sethos*, *Sethosis*, &c. And then it cannot be thought strange, that as his whole *Book* is denominated from his *Chronological Period*, so that *Period* it self should be ascribed to the *Egyptian Seth*, and consequently the *Pillars* also from which these accounts were taken. It may be another account may be given of this matter, that by the *Pillars* of *Seth* may be meant only their belonging to *Egypt*. So it appears that the same King who was called *Egyptus* by the *Greeks*, was by the *Egyptians* themselves

(*) *Censor.* ded. nat. c. 18.

(*) Οἱ δὲ τοῖς δὲ τοῖς φυσικοῖς καὶ τῶν ἀπ' Ἀστρολογίας Μαθηματικῶν ἔνια μιγνύντες Τυφῶνα μὲν ὅλον τὸν Ἡλιακὸν κόσμον. *Plutarch.* de *Isid.* & *Osirid.* p. 367. C. And a little after: Διὸ τὸν Τυφῶνα Σὴθ ἀεὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καλοῦσιν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καταδυναστεῦον ἢ καταβιαζόμενον. Where we have the *signification* of *Seth* in the *Egyptian Tongue*, and the reason why the *Sun* and *Typhon* were called so. Again, Τὸ Σὴθ αὐτὸν Τυφῶνα καλοῦσι φράζει μὲν τὸ καταδυναστεῦον καὶ καταβιαζόμενον. p. 371. B. Again ὁ δὲ Τυφῶν (ὥσπερ εἴρηται) Σὴθ. p. 376. A.

ſelves called *Sethos*, and as it ſeems from thence concluded by *Manetho* to have been the ſame with him whom the *Greeks* called *Ægyptus* the Brother of *Danaus*, (who neither was himſelf known to the *Ægyptians*, by the name of *Danaus* but *Armais*) becauſe *Sethos* in the *Ægyptian* Tongue, ſignified the ſame thing as *Ægyptus* in the *Greek*. Now the Name of *Egypt* was derived from the Name of *Ægyptus*, by which he was known to the *Greeks*, and therefore proportionably the Name of *Sethos* muſt have derived the like denomination of *Sethos* to his *Country*. So *Theophilus Antiochenus* from *Manetho*: Ἀιγυπτος ἡ νῦν χώρα ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως Σέθως τὸ γὰρ ΣΕΘΩΣ φασὶν ΑΙΓΥΠΤΟΣ καλεῖσθαι. Which, being once admitted, will open a further way of expounding *Joſephus*'s γῆ Συριάδι, which muſt be reconciled with the place where the *Mercurial Pillars* were placed by *Manetho*, and is by him called Σηριαδική. And to derive this yet higher, the uſual occaſion theſe emulous Nations took for challenging the glorious *Actions* or *Perſons* of each others to themſelves, was when themſelves alſo had *Actions* or *Perſons* of the ſame *Name*. Now *Heliopolis* in *Egypt* was Famous for thoſe *Mercurial Writings*.

*Theoph. Antioch.* L. III. ad Autolyc.

Ant. l. 3.

And

And therefore they who were ambitious of challenging them to themſelves, were to take occaſion of doing ſo from a *Heliopolis* of their own. Accordingly the *Chaldæans*, for their *Xiſuthrus* pitched on *Heliopolis* in *Sippara*, and the *Phœnicians* had their *Heliopolis* at Mount *Libanus*, a *Sacred* place, and particularly Famous for their *Baitulia*. And when they had, on this pretence, claimed *Mercury* as their own, the change was very obvious, from Σπειραδικὴ to Συειραδικὴ, for them who were willing from thence to conclude, that theſe *Mercurial Pillars* were to be expected only in *Syria*, where their *Heliopolis* was placed. The very Analogy of *Grammar* is ſufficient to ſhew that it was a *willful* and *deſigned* variation. Συειρὰ had indeed been *Greek*, but ἡ Συειρά, though in the Dative Caſe, ſeems to have been a change from Συειραδικῇ, as that alſo from Σπειραδικῇ, on the deſign now mentioned. And there is ſtill a footſtep of Σπειραδικὴ as the Antienteſt Reading in *Joſephus*, that *Euſtathius* reads it Σπϊρειὰδ, *Hexaem.* And this very Origination of this *Word* is a ſtrong Preſumption that Συειραδικὴ rather than Συειγγικὴ (as ſome Learned Perſons would have it from *Ammian*) is indeed an Antient Reading

*Bochart.* Chanaan L. 11. c. 2.

*Ammian Marcellin.* l. 22. *Val-ſ.* in loc. Sir *John Marſham.* Chro. Can. Sec. 1. p. 39. Ed. *Lipſ.*

in *Joſephus*. That I may not now mention the Antient *Tranſlation* of *Joſephus* by *Caſſiodore*, and as many of the *Antients* as followed either *that* or the *Greek* near thoſe times, who generally take it for *Syria* on the account now mentioned. I confeſs I cannot eaſily diſtruſt *Ammian* in what he ſays concerning thoſe *Syringes*, where thoſe *Sacred Hieroglyphical* Inſcriptions were, which were deſigned to be preſerved from a *deluge*, becauſe he pretends to write *viſa pleraque*, what he had ſeen with his own Eyes. I confeſs I am apt to think that theſe *Syringes*, were the places deſigned for the ſo much celebrated *Pillars* of *Mercury*, though theſe Inſcriptions were in *Vaults under ground* (thoſe were properly *Syringes*) and in *Walls* rather than *Pillars* (though I know how largely the Notion of στῆλαι may be underſtood) becauſe I cannot think they had them in two places, for that ſame reaſon of preſerving them from the *Deluge*. Yet the Country where they were, might have been called *Seriadica*, and that it was ſo, we have, before *Joſephus*, the more Antient Teſtimony of *Manetho*. Beſides it is conſiderable, that the Doctrine of the two Deſtructions of the World, one by *Fire*, another by *Water*, which is pre-

*Ib.* p. 413.

tended

tended as the occaſion of erecting theſe two *Pillars*, is originally *Ægyptian*. And they, no doubt on pretence of ſuch *Pillars*, boaſted themſelves alone to have preſerved their *Hiſtories*, through the ſeveral *Deluges* and *Conflagrations*. And from this confounding the *Babylonian* and *Ægyptian* accounts, which followed upon their ſeveral reſpective *Emulations*, I ſuppoſe it was, that theſe Inventers of the Fable of *Seth*, were ſo particular in telling us the very *materials* of thoſe *Pillars*. The *Ægyptian Syringes* were, as it appears from *Ammian* cut out of a *Quarry*, and therefore were of ſolid ſtone. But the *Babylonian* mentioned by *Epigenes* were *Coctilibus Laterculis*, for which that place was Famous. Theſe two ſo well fitting the deſign of preſerving them from the *Conflagration* and the *Deluge*, made them, who were willing to confound things for Intereſts of their own, to be as I ſaid ſo very particular, not conſidering that by the account given in *Plato*'s *Timæus*, the *Ægyptians* had another pretence of preſerving their own *Inſcriptions* from the *Conflagration* as well as from the *Deluge*.

Vid. *Platon in Tim.* qui ea habuit ab *Ægyptiis*.

*Ammian*, L. xxiii.

Ap. *Plin.* N. H. vii. 56.

§. XIV. SO alſo, for the *Writings* from whence our *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have collected his Hiſtory, there ſeems

little doubt but they were also designed for the same with those of *Mercury*; as also that the Subject of these *Writings*, were taken from those *Plates* and *Pillars* now mentioned. *Philo Byblius* himself expressly says, that *Sanchoniathon* enquired very carefully into the Notions of *Taautus*; That *Taautus*, to whom they were ascribed, was no other than (*) *Mercury*, will, I believe, need no proof. And these *Mystical Books* of the *Ammonians* being joyned with them, makes it yet more probable. For even among our present Counterfeits under the Name of *Mercury*, we have an Epistle of *Asclepius* to *Ammon*, concerning the Concealment of their *Philosophical Mysteries*, with several other Fragments of the like address in *Stobæus Eclog. Phys.* by which we see that those unfaithful dealers with *Hermes*, did both joyn this *Ammon* with him whom they make a King in *Libya* (very probably with some relation to the Famous *Libyan* Oracle of *Jupiter Ammon*) and withal, made the same *Ammon* a very zealous Patron of those *Philosophical Mysteries*. So that this holds exact correspondence with those other Cheats, and looks as if it belonged to the same Forge. Unless possibly we may refer it to that more

(*) *Philo Byblius* says so expresly in *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. A.

more Antient Conjunction of *Thoth* and *Thomuz*, and the God of the *Ægyptian Thebes*, called *Ammon* in *Plato* himſelf, whence it comes to paſs that the *Ægyptian Thebes* has, in the Prophets, the Name of *No-Ammon*, as it was uſual, and, as *Diodorus* obſerves moſt proper to the *Ægyptians*, to denominate their *Cities* from their *Deities*. It may be this may be the reaſon why the Name of *Ammon* is ſo uſually made uſe of in the accounts of the *Ægyptian Philoſophy*, becauſe the Name it ſelf ſeems an off ſpring of *Ham*, aſcribed in the Scripture to the Land of *Ægypt* it ſelf, ſo that the *Ammonian Philoſophy* is no more than a *Colony* of the *Ægyptian*. And theſe Ἀπόκρυφα γράμματα, theſe *Myſtical Writings* were moſt properly aſcribed to this God, whoſe very *Name*, as *Manetho* expounds it, ſignified in the *Ægyptian Tongue*, τὸ κεκρυμμένον καὶ ἀφανές. How much more proper an *Etymology* is this, than that which *Bochart* gives elſewhere from the *Hebrew*, where his Intereſt for *Sanchoniathon*, obliges him to make theſe *Ammonian Writings Phœnician*?

In *Phædr.* p. 213.

Ap. *Plutarch.* de Iſ. & Oſirid.

De *Phœn.* Col. 11. 17.

§. XV. But to examine now the Credibility of his pretence to theſe Means; it is firſt conſiderable that, ſeeing theſe *Records* were *Ægyptians*, it is not eaſie to explain

plain how *Sanchoniathon* himſelf, a Man of another Nation, could have acceſs to them. The difficulty *Pythagoras* found notwithſtanding the powerful recommendation of *Polycrates* to *Amaſis* who was his *Hoſpes*, ſhews how averſe they were to communicate their *Myſteries* to *Foreigners*. But it was not at all to be expected by Perſons *uncircumciſed*, as the *Phœnicians* were undoubtedly in the pretended Age of *Sanchoniathon*. But ſuppoſing he had Conquered the difficulties of acceſs, and ſubmitted, as *Pythagoras* ſeems to have done, to Circumciſion; yet the *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians*, and much more the *Myſtical Hieroglyphicks* of the *Ægyptians* (of which kind the Sacred *Inſcriptions* of their *Pillars* generally were) depended ſtill on a higher degree of *good will* and *fidelity* of the *Prieſts* for their *Explication*. And who can undertake that they would, after all, deal *Faithfully* with him? Eſpecially if they had ſuſpected the leaſt deſign in him of committing them to *Writing*, and *divulging* them to Poſterity? And after all, what judicious Perſon would not rather enquire for this Information *Originally* from the *Ægyptians* themſelves? Who would not rather have truſted *their preſent* ſenſe

*Porphyr.* de vit. *Pythag.* p. 183. vid. Not. *Holſten.*

ſenſe in which they were agreed, even in *later* times, than ſuch *Second-hand* Relations concerning the ſenſe of their *Anceſtors*? And then, what will become of this ſo much applauded Teſtimony of *Sanchoniathon*, if *Phœnician* matters muſt not be expected from him, as they could not from ſuch means of Information; and if the Teſtimony even of the *later Ægyptians* muſt be preferred before him? I am very well aware that the whole credit of this Author depends on the contrary ſuppoſition, that both theſe *Pillars* of *Taautus*, and *Apocryphal Books* of the *Ammonians*, were in *Phœnicia*, and concerned *Phœnician* Affairs, and in the *Phœnician* Tongue or *Characters*, that a Native *Phœnician* might be preſumed fitteſt to underſtand them.

§. XVI. THIS will indeed, and will alone, make him ſo *credible* as he is thought to be. And it is plainly ſuppoſed in the Author himſelf, who makes *Hermes* a Native *Phœnician*, and to be made *King* of *Ægypt* by one that was. And this ſeems the moſt likely account how the *Pillars* of *Seth*, (which I ſaid ſeem to be the ſame with thoſe of *Mercury*) came to be placed by *Joſephus* in *Syria*, that he had met them placed there by

Apud *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. 1. 10. p. 36. A. 39. B.

by ſome who were thus in Intereſt, concerned to place them ſo, to juſtifie their other Factions. Beſides Γῆ Σηριαδικὴ in *Manetho* was eaſily corrupted into Συριαδικὴ in *Joſephus*, by them who were willing to have it ſo, as has already been obſerved. And the *Ægyptian* Name of *Seth*, ſo exactly agreeing with the *Hebrew* Name, was a likely *occaſion* of miſtake, and an *Argument* too, for them who had rather have him believed to be a *Hebrew* than an *Ægyptian*. But then againſt this I oppoſe all the contrary, both *Teſtimonies* and *Arguments* that might be produced to prove that *Hermes* was a Native *Ægyptian*, and that *Ægypt* was never ſo ſubdued by the *Phœnicians* as to receive, nor *Phœnicia* in ſuch a ſtrong and flouriſhing condition, as to give them a *King* of their own Nation. That is as many Teſtimonies, as there are or have been *Ægyptian* Writers, not only *after*, but *before* the publiſhing of this pretended *Sanchoniathon*; as many of them, at leaſt, as mention ſuch a Perſon as *Hermes*, as many of them as wrote before theſe Diſputes of Antiquity of Nations were ſtarted, as well as they who wrote afterwards, to abet parties now made, and to drive on deſigns by this time already formed to their hand.

and. The higheſt account of all the *Mercuries* in *Cicero*'s time, that was given by them who had then the curioſity to inquire into the *Gods* of the *ſame Name*, amounted not to above five, and among them no mention of any one that was a *Phœnician*, a ſign none ſuch was ſo much as challenged by them, till this pretended *Sanchoniathon*. The ſame account is followed by others afterwards, by *Ampelius* and *Arnobius*, a ſign that even *then* this fictitious *Phœnician* was not of that credit, as to be thought worthy to encreaſe the received Number. And theſe were ſufficient to be oppoſed to the true *Sanchoniathon* himſelf. The Original Writings of *Taautus*, and the *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians* muſt have been theirs, and could have been Interpreted by none but them, if we will allow any thing to the concurrent Teſtimonies of *diſintereſſed* Antiquity. But how much more than ſufficient are they to over-ſway the *Vouchers* for *him*, and for all thoſe *things* alſo which recommend him as ſo very creditable? How much Antienter? How much freer from deſign? That I may not now deſcend to Perſonal Compariſons.

De Nat. Deor. L. III.

*Arnob.* adv. Gent. L. iv.

§. XVII. BUT (poſſibly to avoid the difficulty to be ſuppoſed in underſtanding Writings

Writings of this Nature;) it is ſuppoſed that *Taautus* either *found* or *made* all things *clear*; that he Originally wrote them ſo whatever he wrote upon his own knowledge; that he *made* them ſo, where he did not, as in his diſcovery of theſe *Myſtical Books* of the *Ammonians*, from ſome Monuments of their own, concealed in their *Adyta*, and of difficult acceſs, but yet procured and divulged by him; that he unriddled the Tales and *Allegories* wherein they had been Originally concealed. But that the later *Prieſts* again retrived their *Mythologies* and Arts of concealment. That as for the *Mercurial* Books themſelves the Son of *Thabion* was the firſt who turned them into *Allegory*, from whom they came to the *Greeks*. That many Generations afterwards *Surmubelus*, the *God* (I ſuppoſe ſo Sir-named like *Antiochus*, and *Diodorus Cronus* the *Philoſopher*, from *Saturn*, and *Pior* the *Ægyptian* from *Apollo*, that I may inſtance alſo in *private Perſons* who were *Sir-named* from *Gods*, not only *denominatively*,) and *Thuro* a Woman Sir-named *Chuſarthis*, explained thoſe *Allegories*. That by this means they might come clear to *Sanchoniathon* from *Writings*, without Perſonal Diſcoveries of the *Prieſts*, which

*Sanchon.* apud *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. B.

Ap. *Euſ.* ib. p. 39. C.

ib. p. 40. B.

was

was not to be expected. This seems contrived, as if it were on purpose to defend the Credit of these Informations.

§. XVIII. BUT how many things are here supposed no way consistent with the Notions of those times? We see it is acknowledged that the Arts of *concealment* of *Mysteries*, had been taken up and used before, because *Taautus* is said to have unriddled those of the *Ammonians*. And who know not how great a *Piaculum* it was thought to *divulge Mysteries*? How particularly Superstitious the *Antients* were that way, as appears from the Fables of *Phineus* and *Prometheus*? And (concerning the *Ægyptians*) from their Worship of *Harpocrates*? How it was Capital for the Person who endeavoured it, and how they would no doubt have *suppressed* such Publications of their *Mysteries* if it lay in their power to do so? How then could *Sanchoniathon* come by them who lived so many Ages after? Was it because they *could not* suppress all Copies of what had once escaped them at *first*, especially not such as were in the Hands of the *Phœnicians*, who were not obnoxious to their Jurisdiction? But would they, at last, have paid that *Honour* to the Memory of a Person guilty of a Crime then reputed

reputed ſo very *impious* as to make him a *God*? Would they not rather have erected *Pillars* to his diſgrace (from whence came afterwards the popular notion of σηλιτεύειν) than borrowed all their *Sacred Rites* and *Inventions* from his *Books* or *Pillars*? Would they have aſcribed all their *Solemnities* of *Religion* (as it appears they did from *Clemens Alexandrinus*) to ſuch a *Prophaner* of their *Secrets*, to ſo impious a violator of their received Religion?

Strom. vi.

§. XIX. AND who indeed was more unlikely to have ſuch an accuſation laid to his charge, than he that was reputed the Firſt Inſtitutor of their *Religion*, the firſt Impoſer of that Sacred *ſilence* which they took for ſo neceſſary a Duty of all that would pretend to be *Religious*? Why ſhould they aſcribe their *Hieroglyphicks* and their *Sacred Characters* to him, if they had not thought that he had invented them purpoſely for this concealment? But conſider him even as the Inventor only of their *Letters* (an Invention expreſly aſcribed to him by this pretended *Sanchoniathon* himſelf) and they cannot ſhew it poſſible for him to make that diſcovery he is pretended to have made from the very *Writings* of the *Ammonians*. For all other

*Sacrarum literarum peritos facit.* Jul. Firmic. Matheſ. Lib. III. c. 8.

*Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 36. A.

other *Sacred* ways but *Letters*, were of so æquivocal signification, as nothing could be gathered from them without the *Oral Traditions* of their *Priests*. And therefore he could not have made so great Discoveries by *Books*, if himself were the first Inventor of *Letters*.

§. XX. BUT who is this Son of *Thabion*, who is said to have turned them back into *Allegories*, and from whom they came at last to the *Greeks*? I suppose *Agathodæmon*, or the Second *Mercury* the Father of *Tat*, who is said by *Manetho* to have translated the Books of the said *Elder Mercury* into *Greek*, but yet Γράμμασιν ἱερογλυφικοῖς, that is in the *Sacred Ægyptian Letter*, contradistinct from that which was of common use, possibly that though the *words* were, yet the *Characters* might not be understood by the *Greeks* without the *Priests* assistance, which he also secured by placing them in the *Adyta*. All these things seem exactly to agree with the present Fragments of the *Mercurial* Writings in *Greek*, where the *Elder Mercury* is blamed by *Ammon* for divulging their *Mysteries*; where the *Second Mercury* is he who generally speaks in his *own* Person, the *Elder* is spoken of in the *Third*, and *Tat* is mentioned as his *Son*, and the Μυστήριον ἀποκεκρυμμένον is so of-

Ap. *Euseb.* G. p. 6. Ed. *Scaliger.*

ten mentioned, where the very *Pillars* are mentioned, and that they were to be *divulged* to Posterity from those *Pillars*, as appears from a Fragment of them extant in *Stobæus*. Yet it does not appear that *Manetho* published that Text of those *Mercurial Books* he pretends to have used out of the *Sacred Ægyptian*, into the common *Greek* Character. That he might forbear to do as a *Priest*. Possibly *Numenius* might have contributed hereunto, who is therefore charged by his own *Heathen* Brethren for divulging *Mysteries*. Whoever did so, seems also to have enlarged those of *Manetho*, with other things he took for *Mercurial*, as will appear hereafter. However these very allusions to these *Greek Mercurials*, are sufficient to convict this pretended *Sanchoniathon* of *falsehood*, in the opinion of such as believe the *Mercurials* themselves to be *Forgeries*, and Forgeries much later than the time that *Sanchoniathon* pretends to. However, if they were again involved by this Second *Hermes*, how comes *Sanchoniathon* to have understood them? But if this *Surmubelus* and *Thurò* had extricated them before the time of *Sanchoniathon*, how comes *Orpheus* (who must have been *Elder* or contemporary with him, if he flourished at, or a little before, the War of *Troy*, and

*Stob.* Eclog. Phys.

*Macrob.* in somn. Scipon. L. 1. c. 2.

and who is generally ſuppoſed to have borrowed his Notions from the *Ægyptians*) not to have underſtood them free from *Allegories*, as well as this pretended *Sanchoniathon*? But to proceed.

§. XXI. HE is pretended alſo to have borrowed his Informations from *Hieromb-baal* the *Prieſt* of the God *Jevo*. There is little reaſon to doubt but that he meant *Gideon*, who was by his Father *Foaſh* Sir-named *Jerubbaal*. The putting of *H* before *Hebrew* Words beginning with *I* (that is, putting *Aſpirations* where in the Original, the *J* is Conſonant) is ſo common, that I believe none will doubt of it. Inſtances are very obvious, as in *Hieremias*, *Hieruſalem*, *Hiericho*, *&c.* And the MS. *Greek* μ is as eaſie to have been miſtaken for a ω, which is their Mark for β. which is an ordinary occaſion of miſtake in multitudes of MSS. Eſpecially in the leſs skillful *Publiſhers* of Printed Books from MSS. and this Name is at this preſent Written *Jerobaal*, with an *o* in the Vulgar *Latin* Text, *Judg.* vi. 32. And almoſt as little reaſon is there to doubt, but that the Name *Jevo*, is only a *Greek* imitation of the *Tetagrammaton*, the middle and final *Aſpirations* being utterly unexpreſſible in the *Greek* Tongue. But *Jud.* vi. 32.

neither is this account of his Information, any thing more creditable than the others. How could *Gideon* be a *Priest*, who was of the Tribe of *Manasseh*? Was it on account of the *Ephod* which *Gideon* made? But where is there the least intimation that he wrote it himself? Nay, when he is said to have placed it in his own City of *Ephra*, it seems to imply, that it was placed there for another's wearing. And how comes it to pass, that the Scripture should pass it over in silence, that is so punctual in taking notice of Violations of the *Priesthood*, in matters of lesser consequence in *Jeroboam* and others? But how could *Sanchoniathon* have been guilty of such a mistake, in so fresh a memory of *Gideon*, in so near a Neighbourhood of the *Jews*, in a matter wherein then the meanest of them could have informed him, (so careful they were then to keep up the memory of their *Tribes*) if he had been so diligent in procuring Information, as is pretended? Suppose he had been so negligent himself; yet, how could King *Abibalus*, to whom he is said to have *Dedicated* his Book? How could all his *contemporary Enquirers after Truth*, from all whom, he is pretended to have received commendations, be yet all so mistaken

*Jud.* viii. 27.

Οἱ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐξεταςαὶ τῆς ἀληθείας Verba *Porphyrii* ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9 31. A.

ſtaken in a thing of ſo eaſie Information? Yet to make this fancy concerning *Gideon's Prieſthood* look more likely, the excellent *Bochart* conceives that the *Baal Berith*, with whom the *Iſraelites* committed *Idolatry* after the death of *Gideon*, muſt have been the God of *Berytus*, *Sanchoniathon's* own City. But it ſeems moſt likely, that this *Baal Berith* was the *God* (not the *Goddeſs*) to whom *Gideon's Ephod* was Conſecrated, at his own City *Ephra*. That *Ephod* is ſaid to have been a *ſnare* to *Him* and his *Family*. And accordingly this *Baal Berith's* Temple, furniſhed the *Sichemites* with Arms in their Conſpiracy with *Abimelech*, which proved the ruin of the greateſt part of *Gideon's* Family. If ſo, then there was no ground to make this *Baal Berith* the ſame with *Jao*, to whom *Philo Byblius* would have us believe that *Gideon* was *Prieſt*. However, there is no probability that *Berith* (if it muſt needs be the name of a *place*) could be the ſame with *Berytus*. This *Berith*, where the *Sichemites* dwelt was in all likelyhood under the Dominion of the *Iſraelites*, but *Berytus* was in *Phœnicia*, and was in *Sanchoniathon's* time (if we may believe *Philo Byblius*) under a diſtinct *King* from *Iſrael*. Beſides the diff-

Ph. Col. II. 17.

Judg. viii. 33.

Judg. viii. 27.

Judg. iv. 4.

ferent ways of writing these words in the *Hebrew*, gives little occasion for such a mistake. The *Phœnician Berytus* was so called as *Stephanus* tells us, rather from בארות διὰ τὸ ἔνυδρον, βίς γὰρ τὸ φρέαρ παρ' αὐτοῖς. And it is observable, that *Stephanus* seems to have taken what he had concerning these *Phœnician* places, from *Philo Byblius* himself, as might have been shewn in several Instances, and is on another occasion confessed by *Bochart* himself. If this were taken from him also, then it will at least follow, that this affinity between the *Names* of *Berith* and *Berytus*, could have been no occasion of mistake to *Philo Byblius*. Which as to our present purpose, is of much greater consequence, than what that same Learned Person observes from *Nonnus*, who takes *Berytus* for *Beroe*, the Daughter of *Venus* and *Adonis*. This therefore, looks like one of those ill-meant Blunders, which those Modern *Greeks* were ordinarily guilty of in the *Jewish* History, who pretended, no doubt from the like Records, to give other accounts of them, than their own writings had done of themselves, only with a design to asperse their Nation. Thus *Moses* is made a Woman, called *Moso* by *Alexander Polyhistor*. *Moses* and *Joseph* are joyned

*Phœn.* Col. 11, 12.

*Suid.* Μωσὼ. ap. *Josepb.* c. Ap. 1. 1057.

joyned together as *contemporaries* in *Chæremon*. But *Moſes* is the Son of *Joſeph* in *Trogus Pompeius*, Epitomiz'd by *Juſtin*. Many more Inſtances might have been given, if it had been neceſſary. Nor will the Anſwer of *Bochart* ſerve to excuſe him here. כהן may indeed alone ſignifie a *Prince* as well as a *Prieſt*. But when it is joined with the *God*, to whom he is ſaid to have been *Prieſt*, that were alone ſufficient to determine the ſignification, from any ambiguity of which it might otherwiſe have been capable. But beſides I ſhall (*) hereafter have occaſion to ſhew his deſign in making him a *Prieſt*, for recommending what he was to deliver on his *Teſtimony*.

*Juſt. Hiſt.* xxxvi. 2.

(*) §. 33.

§. XXII. BUT poſſibly his pretended *Memoires* of *Gideon*, might have given him the Title of *Prieſt*, and *Sanchoniathon* a *Stranger*, a likely occaſion of ſuch a miſtake. If they did ſo, then this it ſelf had been a ſufficient Argument, that they could not have been *Gideon's*. And then, what credit muſt that part of his Hiſtory be of, which relyes on ſo uncreditable Informations? And indeed, how unlikely is it, that *Gideon* ſhould have left ſuch *Memoires* behind him? In all likelyhood, what had come from him,

would have been *accounted Prophetical*; at leaſt, if it had been undoubted, would have been made ſo by the atteſtation of the *Sanhedrim*, who were by God himſelf eſtabliſhed for the Authentical *Judges* of *Prophets*. Which is the moſt defenſible way for aſſerting the Divinity of the *Anonymous* Authors of the *Old Teſtament*. And if ſo, what probability had there been of their miſcarriage? Nay, ſuppoſing them only *Human*, and of no higher repute among the *Jews*; yet, who can think they would have neglected ſo precious a Monument of their *Antiquity*, from ſo ſure a hand as *Gideon*'s? But there is not the leaſt *Memory* of ſuch a Work among the *Jews*, not in their *Canonical Hiſtories*; not in the multitudes even of *Counterfeits*, that were Antient, or were ever received, even among the *Helleniſts*, of which we have any account, either in their Antient *Stichometriæ*, or in any Antient *Quotations*; not ſo much as in any *Quotation* of thoſe *Canonical Writers* that lived near thoſe times, and quote ſeveral extant then, which have ſince miſcarried, as the Book of *Jaſher*, of the *Wars of the Lord*, &c. Not even in the Book of *Judges*, where his Teſtimony had been moſt uſeful for continuing the *Jewiſh* Hiſtory,

History, from the death of *Joshua*, to his own time. Can we think they would thus generally have neglected him, if they had known him, or thought him Genuine? Can we think the *Phœnicians* would have valued him, if his own *Country-men* had so neglected him?

§. XXIII. Certainly, if he ever had any such *Memoires*, or made use of them any where, it must have been, most probably, where, he gives account of *Jewish* matters. But his accounts concerning them, are so full of *mistakes*, of mistakes so inconsistent even with *Jewish* Interest, as could not, with any probability, have been occasioned by any *Jewish* Testimonies; much less by so grave an unexceptionable a Testimony as that of *Gideon*. I have had occasion to mention one instance already, that of his making *Gideon* a *Priest*. And such generally are the rest of his accounts of *Jewish* affairs, as far as we can judge of them, by the few Fragments preserved to us by *Porphyry*. He makes *Abraham* a Native *Phœnician*, and the same with the *Greek* Saturn, who bestowed *Attica* on *Minerva*. What *Jew* would have rob'd his Nation of their *Father Abraham* they so much boasted of, would have derived them from the *Uncircumcised*

By the Name of *Saturn* ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 36. C. p. 38. D.

*cumcis'd Philistines*, so much abhorred and despised by them? Would have dishonoured *Abraham* himself, so far as to have made him a *Heathen Deity*, a thing so detested by the *Jews*? He makes him *actually* Sacrifice his Son. It is plain what Interest obliged him to say so, *viz.* that he might hereby give an account of that Antient, but Inhuman Custom, of *Sacrificing* their own Children to him, under the name of *Saturn* or *Moloch*. For this was generally the design of the *Heathen Mysteries*, to commemorate some memorable Action of their *Deity*. Thus the pleasure that *Ceres* took in the obscene behaviour of *Bauho*, was commemorated in the *Eleusinian Mysteries*. And the like delight that *Hercules* took in the *Plow-man's Curses*, when he was eating his Plow-Oxen, was also remembred with the like *Curses* still repeated in the Solemnities of the Worship of *Hercules*. But what ground could he have in doing so, from the *Old Testament*? He might indeed from the later *Mystical* Expositions of the *Hellenists*, who speak of it as done, because it was reckoned to him as done in the *Divine acceptance*, *Gen.* xxii. 16. Therefore St. *Paul* says he *Offered him*, *Heb.* xi. 17. adding withal, that he *received*

*ved him from Death in a Figure*, v. 19. And the expreſſion of having actually *offered him*, is alſo uſed by St. *Clemens* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians*. If it were hence that he derived his miſtake, that will alſo prove him Counterfeited about the time he was firſt produced. He gives alſo different accounts of the reaſon why *Abraham* ſhould have offered his Son. Sometimes, κινδύνων ἐν πολέμῳ μεγίστων κατειλημμένον τὴν χώραν ſometimes again, λοιμῷ γενομένῳ ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν. I know not whether any occaſion of the former account, might have been taken from 2 *Kings* iii. 27. *Am.* i. 16. where the King of *Moab* being preſſed by diſtreſs of *War*, offer'd a *Firſtborn* Son; but not his own, but the King of *Edoms*. But there is no pretence of either in *Abraham*'s caſe from any *Jewiſh* Records, nor conſequently could he have theſe different Informations from the *Memoires* of *Gideon*, unleſs we can ſuppoſe them, not only different from all the Authentick Records of his *Nation*, but from themſelves alſo, theſe things being the Principal in this Author, that concern the *Jews*, and yet, being ſo impoſſible to have been taken from any *Memoires* of *Gideon*, make me verily ſuſpect, that the Forger of this Author himſelf, as he did not

*Clem.* ad Corinth. Ep. 1. §. 10.

P. 40. D.

P. 38. D.

not *uſe*, ſo neither did he know of any ſuch *Memoires*, either truly or pretendedly paſſing under the Name of *Gideon*, at leaſt, not owned for ſuch among the *Jews*. Which as it is a clear conviction of his deſigned diſingenuity in a matter not excuſable by any pretence of Ignorance; ſo it will render him juſtly liable to a ſuſpicion of a like diſingenuity in his other fair pretences, though we had not the like evidence of conviction of them. At leaſt no ſuch pretences to means of Information muſt be truſted on his *word*, and there is no better pretended for them.

§. XXIV. BUT, to let the Informations alone, the work it ſelf affords Intrinſick Arguments enough of juſt ſuſpition. A great occaſion of the *Forgeries* of thoſe times, was the *Emulation* of ſeveral Nations, for glory of Inventions and Antiquity. Hence it came to paſs, that of all glorious Inventions, and of all Famous Perſons, ſo very different and inconſiſtent accounts are given by the *Hiſtorians* of the ſeveral Rival Nations, each of them challenging them for their own. Hence ſuch a multitude of *Jupiters*, *Hercules*'s *Æſculapius*'s, *Diana*'s, &c. nay, and of *Homers* too, different not only in Nation,

on, but in Age too, yet pretending gene-
ally to the glory of the ſame Actions.
t muſt needs be, that of ſo inconſiſtent
eports concerning the ſame Perſon, all
ut one muſt have been not miſtakes,
ut deſigned *Forgeries*. Which I there-
ore note to ſhew that, as it was not unu-
ual, ſo neither was it new, to *Forge* on
uch occaſions. Yet they pretended ge-
erally to honeſt means of Information.
Now this pretended *Sanchoniathon*, is full
f this vanity of arrogating uſeful Inven-
ions and Perſons to his own *Phœnicia*.
Which, as they will prove him *later* than
heſe *Æmulations* of ſeveral Nations about
Antiquity, much later than the time pre-
ended for the true *Sanchoniathon*; ſo
hey will expoſe him to all the *Teſtimonies*
nd *Arguments* that may be produced for
he ſeveral Nations againſt him in *all*, or
*ny* of the reſpective Particulars. If he
an be diſproved or charged with indirect
dealing in any one particular, that will be
ufficient to weaken his credit in all the
reſt. Let us come therefore to the par-
iculars.

XXV. THUS he aſcribes the Invention of
Iron, to the *Phœnician* Χρυσωρ, in all like- Ap. *Euſeb.*
lihood, the ſame with Χρυσάωρ in *Heſiod*, Pr. Ev. l.
whom he makes the Famous *Vulcan*; where- 10. p. 35.
C.

as

*Hesiod.* Theolog. 281. 287. as the *Scripture* attributes the same t *Tubal Cain*, and the *Græcians*, to the *Id Dactyli*, not long before the Wars o *Troy*. For *there* we find that all the *Arm* of the *Heroes*, both *offensive* and *defensiv* were of *Brass*, as appears by *Homer*, an is observed by the *Scholiast*, on *Apollon us Rhodius* and *Pausanias*, which ar great suspicions that the Invention of *Iro* was late, because it had not as yet reache those Parts. But it is indeed strange, tha *Vulcan* should here be taken for a *Phœni cian*, who is by the *Ægyptians*, reporte to have been the notorious Original o the first Generation of their *Deifie Kings*; The design of which *Deifyin* being observed by this *Philo* himself, t have been the honour of some profitabl Invention for Human Life, will make i likewise probable, that he was also take for the *Inventor* of *Fire* and *Iron*. Ther were indeed several *Vulcans* observed b the *Antients*, but not above *Four*, an among them none that appears to hav been thought *Phœnician*. Thus also h makes *Magus* the Son of the Ἀλῆϑ an *Titanes*, which were accounted bad *Dæ mons*. Who sees not here an instance o that ordinary vanity of the *Græcians*, o turning the *Name* of the *Sect* into a pro

*Cl. Al.* Str. 1. In *Apoll.* Argonnut. L. 1. v. 430. 1196. *Pausan.* Laconic. p. 84.

*Herodot. Euseb.* Græc. *Manetho* p. 6, 7. *Ammian Mercellin.* in Inscrip. in L. xvii. Apud *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 32. D. *Cicer.* de Nat. Deor. L. 111. *Cl. Alex.* Prot. *Arnob.* L. 4. Ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 35. D.

per

per Name of a *Man*, and thence pretending to give an account of their first Institution? Who sees not a plain design to rob the *Chaldæans* of the *Magi*, and to make them a *Phœnician* Invention? Which let him believe, who can find in his heart to do so. I need not to observe, that the whole Sect of the *Magi*, if they were first Instituted by the *Chaldæan Zoroastres*, (who seems to have lived near the time of *Pythagoras*, and is said by some to have conversed with him) they must have been Instituted long after the time of our pretended *Sanchoniathon*, and therefore could not have been taken notice of by him. As for the *Bactrian Zoroastres*, I doubt the very pretending to him was only such another design of robbing the *Chaldæans* of him. *Diodorus* calls him *Oxyartes*, and that was, it may be, his true Name. I might also observe, that when he makes this *Magus* the Son of those *bad Dæmons*, he evidently alludes to the *bad sense* of the Name of *Magus*, which was yet very much later than the Institution of the *Sect* it self. L. 11. Bibl. ex *Ctesia*.

§. XXVI. HE also makes the *Dioscuri*, not only *Phœnicians*, but the same also with the *Corybantes* and *Curetes*. It is evident he could not understand the Ap. *Eusel.* ib. p. 36. *A*.

*Castores*,

*Caſtores*, who were not only *later* than *Sanchoniathon*, but than thoſe *Curetes* and *Corybantes* alſo. The moſt candid ſenſe that can be put upon it, is by the name *Dioſcuri* to underſtand, not the *Sons*, but the *Nurſes* of *Jupiter*. So indeed the word κυείζειν is uſed in *Heſiod* for *Nurſing*. And ſo the *Curetes* or *Corybantes*, are in Truth, ſaid to have *Nurſed* him in the *Antrum Idæum*. But then, the word being *Greek*, could not have been known to the *Phœnician Sanchoniathon*; and what word muſt have anſwered it in his Original *Phœnician*, is not eaſie to gueſs. Nor do I know why *Philo* ſhould uſe it in ſo unuſual a Notion, which yet he elſewhere uſes for them abſolutely, without the explicatory Addition of the Titles of *Curetes* or *Corybantes*. And is not this a plain deſign upon the *Cretan Jupiter*, to make him, as well as his *Nurſes* Originally *Phœnician*? But this may poſſibly be thought excuſable as an *Interpolation* of the *Tranſlator*, who muſt at leaſt, have been the Author of that *Greek* word. For it ſeems evident, not only from this, but the mention of ſeveral other *Greek* words, and of the *Greek* Nation, nay, of the very *Alexandrians*, that he did

Theog. v. 347.

Ap. Euſeb. lib. p. 37.

*Greek* words, Δαγὼν ὡς ὅτι Σίτων, p. 36. becauſe Ζεὺς ἀείτης, p. 27. Οὐρανὸς, Κρόνος, Ἑρμῆς, &c. &c. p. 39. where he quotes *Heſiod*, &c.

did uſe the liberty, rather of a *Paraphraſt*, than of a faithful accurate *Tranſlator*. But then, how ſhall we be able to diſtinguiſh between his *Interpolations*, and the *Text* of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. It ſeems alſo ſtrange, that theſe *Corybantes* or *Cabiri*, or *Samothraces*, which, by the *Græcians* account of them, ſeem to have been the ſame, and to have accompanied the *Mater Deorum* out of *Phrygia* into *Crete*, ſhould here be made immediately *Phœnicians*, though I am apt to believe indeed that their *Myſteries* had ſome *Originally-Phœnician* Ingredients. But it is yet more ſtrange, how they ſhould have found *Crete* inhabited, where they muſt have *Nurſed*, or at leaſt, *received Jupiter*, if themſelves had been the firſt *Inventors of Ships*, as is here pretended, unleſs poſſibly they made uſe of thoſe hard ſhifts, which are here alſo mentioned, as invented before. Which yet is hardly credible of ſo great a *Multitude* as might be thought ſufficient to People the whole Iſland.

*Bochart.* de *Phœn.* Colon. 1.12.

*Ib.* p. 36. A.

§. XXVII. Other inſtances there are of the like *Vanity* and *Affectation* in this Author. Some I have had occaſion to touch at formerly. Who can endure to ſee (1) *Abraham*, to ſee the famous *Ægypti-*

(1) Ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 38. D. & p. 40. C.

(2) *Ib.* p. 36. A. p. 39. B. *an* (2) *Hermes*, made Original *Phœnicians*? This alone, one would think, were sufficient to overthrow those great Elogies that are given him for his *Faithfulness* and *Diligence*, but this is not all *Jupiter Belus*, the famous Founder of the *Assyrian* Monarchy, *Typhon* the Brother of the famous *Ægyptian Osiris* must also be made Originally *Phœnicians*; than which what can be more *certainly false*, if any thing be *certain* in the Antient *Assyrian* or *Ægyptian Histories*. So must also *Adodus* the Father of *Benhadad* King of *Syria* in the *Scripture*, and in *Trogus Pompeius*, and worshipped by the *Syrians* for a *God*. So must *Æsculapius*, whose Sons were *Peloponnesians* and on that account present at the War of *Troy*; besides that himself is reported to have been the Son of *Arsinoe* the Daughter of *Leucippus* a *Messenian*. So must also *Minerva*, if she had *Attica* bestowed on her by the *Phœnician Saturn*. But when were the *Phœnicians* so famous for their Conquests, as to have so great and remote Dominions as *Ægypt*, *Assyria* and *Attica* at their disposal? What writer, even of their own, however partial to his own Country, did so much as pretend it before our pretended *Sanchoniathon*

*Ib.* p. 38. A. *Ib.* D.

*Messenians.* Pausan. in *Messen.* p. 113. *Corin.* p. 68. & alibi.

*thon?* But it is a ſtrange miſtake in *Chronology* (in which it ſeems to have been a ſpecial Providence of God for their Diſcovery, that *Counterfeiters* have generally been unskillful) that ſhe ſhould be made *contemporary*, or rather *later* (*) than *Æſculapius*, as will appear by our Authors computation; whereas *Æſculapius* flouriſhed, as I ſaid before, but little before the War of *Troy*, but *Minerva* ſtrove with *Neptune*, for the Dominion of *Attica* in the time of *Cecrops Diphyes*, ſome hundreds of Years before. There were indeed ſeveral *Minervæ* and *Æſculapii* pretended by them, who had the curioſity to enquire into them, in order to the expoſing them. But this very pretence of a *Multitude*, was later than the times of *Æmulation*, and yet none of thoſe Multitudes pretended to have been *Phœnicians*. The paſſage of *Damaſcius* concerning a *Phœnician Æſculapius*, ſeems plainly tranſcribed from *Philo Byblius*, and therefore ought not to be taken for a diſtinct Authority.

(*) For ſhe is made the Daughter of *Saturn*, p. 36. D. But *Eſculapius* is made the Son of *Syduc*, the Brother of *Miſor*, whoſe Son *Mercury* is ſaid to have been Counſellor to *Saturn* as ſoon as he was come to Man's Eſtate, p. 36. D. And the *Poſterity* of the *Dioſcuri* are made contemporary with *Saturn*, p. 37. B. Which *Dioſcuri* themſelves were Sons of *Syduc*, and conſequently *Brethren* to *Æſculapius*. See p. 36. A.

*Damaſc.* vit. *Iſidor.* ap. *Phot.* Cod. ccxlii. p. 1073.

Ib. p. 38. D.

§. XXVIII. AND why should *Abraham*, if he were the *Phœnician Saturn*, *Circumcise* himself, as this Author also pretends, when it is so well known, that the Antient *Phœnicians* were so averse to it, that a long time after *Abraham*'s death, they are still stigmatized by the name of the *uncircumcised Philistines*? But the design is plain. He had a mind to challenge a Person of such Note for his Country-man; and because the Story of *Abraham*'s making a Covenant with God by *Circumcision*, was one of the most memorable passages of that Great Man's Life, therefore he thought it fit to assert it to their *Saturn*. And it may be the rather, because by this time, when this work was Counterfeited, the *Phœnicians* themselves seem also to have received *Circumcision* from the *Ægyptians*. Who knows but that such Tales as these might have been the reason why *Abraham* was worshipped at *Mamre*, for some considerable time before *Constantine* who first forbad it, with *Idols* and *Sacrifices*; by *Gentiles* as well as *Christians*; by *Phœnicians* as well as those of *Palæstine* and *Arabia*? That *Human Sacrifices* were not among those as they are particularized by *Sozomen* (though they were otherwise the pro-

*Euseb.* de vit. Constant. III. 53. *Sozomen.* Eccl. Hist. II. 4.

perest

reſt for the *Phœnician Saturn*) there as very good reaſon, becauſe they had een, long before that time, forbidden *Roman Laws*. The Firſt *Roman Law* gainſt them was at *Rome*, *An.* 21. C. 657. *Cornelius Lentulus* and P. *Licinius raſſus* being (1) *Conſuls*. After that it as particularly forbidden the *Druids* by ), *Tiberius*, at laſt forbidden every here by the Emperor (3) *Hadrian*. eſides that by the account *Philo Biblyus* imſelf, as well as other Writers of *Phœ-cian* Affairs, give concerning them; theſe *uman Sacrifices*, by the Rules of the *hœnicians* themſelves, ſeem not to have een ordinary, but only reſerved for ſome ery great *diſtreſs*, as an *expiation* to that *gry Dæmon*. But all theſe inſtances do bundantly ſhew how extreamly partial is Author was, in adorning his own Nation with the ſpoils of others. Which not reconcileable either with the *Vera-ity* or *Antiquity* of the true *Sanchonia-hon*. Nor will any ſuppoſable miſtakes *Philo* in *tranſlating* him, ſerve to bring im off in ſo groſs and deſigned inſtances concerning his *Neighbours* and the *Famous Perſons* now mentioned. For they concern *Things*, not *Words* and *Ex-reſſions*; Things very notorious, not

(1 2) *Plin.* Nat. Hiſt. xxx. c. 1.

(3) *Porphy.* de Abſt. 11. 56.

only of *Probable* or *Conjectural* Evidence.

§. XXIX. I cannot therefore but think this Author Counterfeited purposely with a design of confronting the *Antiquity* of the *Scripture*. But who was the *Impostor*, whether *Philo Byblius* or *Porphyry*, that I confess I cannot easily determine. I confess I should rather charge it on *Porphyry*, the abusing of the Name of *Philo*, as well as that of *Sanchoniathon*, were it not for that only Testimony of *Athenæus*, and I have given my reasons why I should otherwise have thought it improbable that *Philo* was the Author of that *Translation*. But because I cannot tell what to say to that express Quotation of *Athenæus* before the time of *Porphyry*, I doubt *Philo* will not easily be discharged of it. For by his Exceptions against the Testimony of *Hecatæus* for what he had Written in *favour* of the *Jews*, That either his work must have been counterfeited; or if genuine, that he himself must have been carried away by the *plausibility* of the *Jewish pretences*: It appears that he was engaged in that Dispute concerning the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, and engaged *against* the *Jews*, and therefore was a Person sufficiently interessed to set on such a disingenuous

Συνηρπάσθη ἀπὸ (ὑπὸ) τῆς περὶ Ἰουδαίοις πιθανότητος *Philo* ap. *Orig.* cont. Cels. l. p. 13.

nuous deſign as far as his *Principles* ould give him leave. And I have al-ady ſhewn how far *Platonical Principles* d ſo. If I may venture to gueſs in a tter that affords no better Arguments an *gueſſes*, I ſhould ſuſpect that *Joſe-us*'s Books againſt *Appion* were the oc-ſion of engaging *Philo* on this Subject. hat *Joſephus* had there produced in de-nce of the *Antiquity* of the *Jews*, was ry probably the πάθος alluded to by *hilo*. I cannot think any other was eant, becauſe *Joſephus* ſeems to have en the *firſt* that engaged in that Diſ-ute (he does not intimate in the leaſt at any had engaged in it before him) nd becauſe the time was ſo ſhort between *oſephus* and *Philo*, that there could hard-be any new occaſion for any one elſe undertake that cauſe that *Joſephus* had very lately, and ſo accurately defend-d. For *Joſephus* wrote his Books againſt *ppion* immediately after his *Antiquities* nd his *Life*, in the Thirteenth Year of *Domitian*, becauſe he dedicated theſe alſo the ſame *Epaphroditus*, who was put to eath in the Year following; and *Philo* eems to have written under *Hadrian*. eſides the fame of *Joſephus*, with all well-iſhers to Learning, and the Eminent ca-

pacities he ſerved in, both among his own *Country-men*, and in the Courts of the *Veſpaſians*, added no doubt a greater Authority to what came from him, and recommended it to the Reading of all curious Perſons, not now to mention the Atteſtations of the *Emperors*, and of King *Agrippa*, and of other Learned Men, *Heathens* as well as others, among whom himſelf reckons *Julius Archelaus* and *Herod*. And this very Teſtimony of *Hecataeus*, which it ſeems ſo gravelled *Philo*, had been produced, and inſiſted on, in this very work by *Joſephus*. Which will therefore make it very probable, that this Work of *Philo Byblius* againſt the *Jews*, was deſigned in anſwer to *Joſephus* againſt *Appion*.

C. *App.* 1. 1037. F.

Cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1048. B. 11. p. 1063. F.

§. XXX. WHICH being ſuppoſed, I conſider further that *Joſephus* in that ſame Work had principally inſiſted on the Teſtimonies of *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, for proving the *Antiquity* of his own *Nation*, as of thoſe who had beſt reaſon to know them; but the *Phœnicians* moſt of all, as being neareſt. Accordingly he Appeals not only to their *Writers* that were extant, but their written *Records*, their Αναγραφαι, which were preſerved to that very time. This could not chooſe but

Cont. *App.* L. 1. p. 1039. C.

C. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1043. E. *Antiq.* viii. 2. p. 258. F. C. *Appion.* 1. p. 1042. B.

ut particularly move *Philo Byblius* as ing himſelf a *Phœnician*, and who might ry well have known *Joſephus* himſelf, he were Threeſcore and Eighteen years ld, at the Two hundred and twentieth *lympiad*, as has been obſerved out of *Sui-a*, though poſſibly the *odd* Number of he *Olympiad*, above Two hundred and wenty, which is requiſite to make him ve to Write concerning the Empire of *Hadrian*, is wanting. I mention not *Sca-iger*'s Ἀναγεφὴ which tells us more parti-ularly, not the *Olympiad* only, but alſo he very year wherein he conceives him o have Written, becauſe it is of no Au-hority. But there was another thing hat added further to the reputation of he *Jews* about that time. Their *Eſſenes* had been in great reputation with as many as had occaſion to hear of them, as a very *Philoſophical* ſort of Perſons. *Pliny* the Elder had mentioned them with great re-ſpect, as afterwards *Porphyry* did alſo. But this concerned only their *Philoſophy* of living. There were alſo among them, others who had written *Books* of *Philoſo-phy*, not only *Ariſtobulus* the *Peripatetick* in the time of *Ptolomæus Philometor*; not only many others intimated, though not named by *Philo* the *Jew*, and *Joſephus*, if

Nat. Hiſt. v. 17. de Abſtin. iv. §. 11, &c.

if he ever lived to finish that work of the Sentiments of the *Jews*, so often promised by him, as I doubt, he did not. These, by Mysticizing the Κοσμογενία of *Moses* to a sense, not very distant from that received among the wisest *Philosophers*, and in a most elegant, rapturous, modish stile (such was that of *Philo* particularly.) They gained so much further on the good opinion of the wise ones of that Age, as to have their Nation, which had formerly been despised as *Barbarous*, now to pass among the Nations which were Famous for Wisdom. And the rather because this way of *Mysticizing* the *Poets*, for the *Greeks*, into a *Systeme* of *Philosophy*, was already taken up by the *Stoicks*, and the other *Dogmatical Philosophers*, who were concerned for the defence of the received *Religions* against the *Atheists* and *Epicuræans*, and *Scepticks*, who had taken great advantage from those *Fables*, for exposing them. Who had withal, been herein imitated by the *Ægyptians*, who had *Allegorized Isis* and *Osiris*, and all their own most Antient Histories. From whom the *Alexandrian Jews* seem willing to differ as little as was possible. Accordingly *Laertius*, who wrote not long after, takes them into that Number; and

Præf. ad Antiq. in fin. & Ant. xx. 9. & alibi sæpe.

Procem. ad vit. Philos. p. 3 B.

d endeavoured, as he was able, to give me account of them, though on the ill formations of *Clearchus* the *Peripatick*. So also *Numenius* before him. *Numen.* ap. *Orig.* c. *Cels.* 1. p. 13. & *Eu.* Pr. Ev. ix. 7.

§. XXXI. BUT there were also other ings that contributed hereunto about e time of which I am speaking. One as the attestation of some *Oracles* reived among the *Heathens* themselves, hich also commended them for that very use wherein they differed from the rest f Mankind. Such was that produced by . *Justin Martyr*, not long after the time f *Philo*, as given by a *Heathen Deity* to *Heathen Enquirer*: So he, Ἐρομένῳ γάρ τινος ὡς αὐτοί φατε) τὸ παρ' ὑμῖν χρηστήριον, τίνας συνέβη θεοσεβεῖς ἀνδρὰς γεγενῆσθαί ποτε, οὕτω τὸ χρηστήριον εἰρηκέναι φατέ. Parnætic. p. 12.

Μοῦνοι Χαλδαῖοι σοφίην λάχον ἠδ' ἄρ' Ἑβραῖοι
Αὐτογένητον Ἄνακτα σεβαζόμενοι Θεὸν αὐτὸν.

God might possibly in this Case, make the *Devil* speak against his own Interest, as he did in the case of *Balaam*. To the same purpose we have other *Oracles* also owned by *Porphyry* (very probably in his Body of *Philosophy Collected out of Oracles*,) whereof some might have been Antienter than the time of *Philo Byblius*. I am not concerned to Dispute what *real* Credit these *Oracles* deserved, yet certainly Ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. x. 10.

tainly they could not chooſe but have been very powerful recommendations to thoſe *Philoſophers* who did actually believe them *Divine*, and that is all for which I am concerned at preſent. To the ſame purpoſe, alſo I refer the advantageous Characters of *Abraham* and *Moſes*, in the *Orphaicks* firſt mentioned in theſe firſt times of *Chriſtianity*. And as *Orpheus* had among the *Heathens* the Reputation of a *Sacred* and *Inſpired Perſon*, ſo his word muſt have been reverenced by them all, but particularly by the *Ægyptians*, and the Diſciples of *Mercury*, becauſe he was taken for a great promoter of their *Philoſophy*. But there was yet a further reaſon that might peculiarly recommend him to the *Ægyptians*. That is, that he was, by ſome Traditions, received by Perſons of great Authority among themſelves, pretended to have been a *Sacred Perſon* to the Deity of *Heliopolis*. So *Chæremon*, a Ἱερογραμματεὺς himſelf, makes *Joſeph* and *Moſes* alſo to have been *Ægyptian* Ἱερογραμματεῖς, in the ſame Notion as the *Jew*, alſo had their *Sacred Scribes*. And *Manetho* a *High Prieſt* and *Scribe*, alſo had delivered the the ſame concerning *Moſes*, that his *Ægyptian* name was *Oſarſyph*, and that he was called ſo from *Oſiris*. So I read

Ap. *Joſeph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1057. B.

*Manetho* ap. *Joſeph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1053. A. & 1054. A. 1055. C.

Ὀσίρεως

Ὁσίρεως rather than Ὀσίωνος the God of *Heliopolis* to whom he was *Prieſt*. The occaſion of pretending this concerning *Joſeph*, might poſſibly be his Marrying the Daughter of *Potipherah* Prieſt of *On*, which by the *Greek* Interpreters and *Demetrius*, was rendred Ἡλιούπολις. Concerning *Moſes*, poſſibly it was his skill in all the *Learning of the Ægyptians*, that which was (1) *Sacred* as well as other ſorts, which they might think he could never have got in ſuch Perfection, if himſelf had not been a *Sacred Perſon*. It is no matter how far they were miſtaken in believing ſo concerning him. Their actual believing ſo, is ſufficient for my purpoſe, to make them entertain a great reverence for his *Philoſophy*.

*Demetrius* ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 21.

(1) *Philo. Jud.* de. vit. *Moſ.* Lib. 1. p. 6c6. B. *Clem. Al.* Strom. 1. p. 343. C. D.

§. XXXII. ACCORDINGLY there was about that time a Sect of the *Philoſophers* themſelves, that began to take notice of thoſe *Myſtical* Expoſitions of the *Law*, and to produce them with reſpect as *Authorities*, with honourable mention of *Moſes* under the Titles of *Legiſlator* and *Prophet*. A name not unuſual to them among the other *Orientals* that were Famous for Wiſdom, but particularly uſed among the *Phœnicians* and *Ægyptians*, and very properly belonging to him as

L.III.adv. *Christian.* ap. *Euseb.* Eccl. Hist. vi. 19.

as a *Scribe* or *Priest* of *Heliopolis*. *Porphy* that inveterate Enemy of *Christianit* takes notice of them, as they who had le our *Christian Origen* the way in his *Alleg rical Expositions*. For such he recko *Numenius*, *Cronius*, *Apollophanes*, *Long nus*, *Moderatus*, *Nicomachus*, *Chæremo* and *Cornutus*. These did not only fo low the way of *Allegorizing*, in turnin the *Heathen Theogonies* into *Mystic* Senses, as appears in the work still ex tant of *Cornutus*, on that Subject. Th was not new. The *Stoicks* whom bo *Cornutus* and *Chæremon* followed, ha begun that long before. They also fo lowed the *Allegorizing Jews*, in allowin the Authority of *Moses*, in quoting hi by the name of ὁ Προφήτης only, which think is not usual with any but those *All gorical Writers*. Thus *Numenius*, wit whom it was very ordinary. Thus *Lo ginus* in that only work which is extan of his, Περὶ Ὕψους. And no doubt it woul have appeared concerning more of them if they had been extant. Nay thus eve afterwards (when the rancours of th *Philosophers* themselves against the Scr ptures were grown higher) *Porphy* himself, and *Chalcidius*, who is therefor by some less considering Persons mistake

*Orig.* c. *Cels.* 1. p. 13. iv. p. 198, 199.

De antr. Nymph. p. 256.

fo

for a *Christian*, who yet presumes to confute (*) his *Prophet* where he dissents from him, though he do it indeed, as became the time he lived in, when the Empire was *Christian*, with civility and great respect. And the first of these which are mentioned by *Porphyry* will, in all likelihood, be earlier than *Philo Byblius*. So will *Apollophanes*, if he were the same who was meant by the Counterfeiter of the Works now extant under the name of *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, who is there made to observe the *Eclipse* at our *Saviours* Death at *Heliopolis* in *Ægypt*; and if that otherwise Learned Impostor have but observed the due *decorum* of time. Much more, if he were the *Stoick*, mentioned by *Athenæus*, but under the corrupt name of *Aphanes*, as contemporary with *Eratosthenes*, and Fellow-Disciple with him to *Ariston Chius*. And some of his Companions in this passage of *Porphyry* were *Stoicks*, as *Cornutus* and *Chæremon*. So will *Numenius*, if it were to him that *Apollonius Tyanæus* wrote that Discourse, whereof we have a Fragment in *Stobæus*. So will also *Cronius* for the same

(*) He reckons *Moses* among those who make *matter* to have a beginning. p. 372. *Edit. Meursii.* But he afterwards joyns himself with those who make it *Eternal* p. 376. 401. 409. 419, &c. Besides his saying concerning *Moses*, *divina, ut ferunt, Inspiratione vegetatus*, plainly implies, that he did not believe him so inspired himself, but that he only delivered herein the Sense of *others*.

*Athen.* Deipnos. vii. 6. vid. *Menag.* in *Laert.* L. vii. p. 186.

Eclog. Physic.

De Antr. Nymph. p. 263.

same reason, whom *Porphyrius* assures to have been Ἑταῖρος, a Friend and acquaintance of *Numenius*. So was *Annaeus Cornutus* certainly, and *Chæremon* the *Stoick*, contemporary with *Martial* under *Domitian*, who must yet have been of at that time, if it were his Book *de Comet* which was mentioned by *Seneca*. And he certainly quoted by *Josephus*.

To him *Persius* writes Sat. V. Lib. xi. Ep. 58.

*Nat. Quæst.* L. vii. c. 5.

confr. *Orig. c. Cels.* l. p. 45.

§. XXXIII. BUT there was also another occasion about this time, which made the *Jewish* Κοσμογενία more taken notice of. Which, though it seems indeed to have proceeded from this, yet recommended it farther, to many who knew nothing the favourable esteem the formention *Philosophers* had for the *Jewish Philosop* it self. That is, that it was about the time, taken into the pretended *Philosop* of the *Ægyptian Hermes*. The name *Hermes* had indeed been mentioned many Authors before the coming of our Saviour. His *Pillars* also are said to have been consulted by *Manetho* for compiling his *History*. But for any *Philosophi Discourses* published under his name, such as the *Pœmander* and *Asclepius* now extant, such as were many more now lost but mentioned by the *Antients*, I believe there can be no Testimonies produc

In *Euseb. Græ.* p. 6.

mu

much Antienter than *Philo Byblius*, at leaſt not as extant in the common *Greek Character* as well as *Tongue*. And yet they could hardly have been much *later*, conſidering that St. *Juſtin Martyr* quotes them about the time of *Antoninus Pius*, as alſo his Contemporary *Apuleius*, if the *Latin* Tranſlation of *Aſclepius* be his, conſidering withal, that (1) *Plutarch* alſo mentions them, an Author undoubtedly equal, if not Antienter than *Philo Byblius*; that (2) *Ælian* does ſo who lived under *Hadrian*, Contemporary with *Philo*; conſidering alſo that before them, the *Ægyptian Hereticks*, the *Baſilidians* eſpecially, and the *Valentinians*, made uſe of many of his Notions. Now thoſe *Hereticks* are generally by the conſent of *Antiquity*, ſaid to have riſen about the time of *Hadrian*. But our moſt Learned Biſhop of *Cheſter* * thinks them Antienter, to whom I refer the Reader for ſatisfaction that deſires it. However, the Author from whom they borrowed their *Hereſies*, ſhould in all reaſon, be ſome while Antienter than they. And

(1) De Iſid. & Oſirid. Ἐν τῇ τῶ Ἑρμῆ λεγομέναις βίβλοις ἰσχυρᾶς γεγράφθαι, &c. p. 375. F.

(2) He quotes ὑπόμνημα τῶ Ἑρμῆ τῷ προφητικῷ concerning the Marks of *Apis*, probably out of thoſe Two and Forty *Myſtical Books* of *Hermes*, which contained the *Rituals* of the *Ægyptian Prieſts*, mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, unleſs poſſibly he did not mean a *Book*, but a *Tradition* Fathered upon *Hermes*, like thoſe mentioned by *Manetho*.

* Vind. *Ign.*

 ſom

from him it is most likely that the *Valentinians* took their *Ogdoas*, and the *Basilidians* their *Magical* Practices, that I may not now descend to a more particular Parallel. Nor yet can I think, as the Learned *Casaubon* does, that any *Christian* (even of those *Hereticks*) counterfeited him. There are such other marks in him, that the Author was indeed a *Heathen*. He calls the *Sun the greatest God of those that are in Heaven, to whom all the Heavenly Gods pay respect, as to their King and Potentate.* And he elsewhere mentions the *God's appearing in the Stars.* That he should call the *Sun God*, might indeed seem agreeable to the *Basilidian Hypothesis*, who made *Abraxas* theirs. But that he should allow all the *Stars* for *Gods* also, seems more than any *Christian* could grant. Yet even this Expression the *Hellenistical Jews* did not scruple. So *Philo* the *Jew*, speaking concerning the Creation of the *Heavens*, says, that it ought therefore to be created first, and of the purest part of *Matter*, Διὸν Θεῶν ἀφανῶν τε καὶ ἀϊδίων ἔμελλεν εἶκὼς ἔσεσθαι ἱερώτατος. These Ἀϊδίοι Θεοὶ were no doubt the *Stars*. However there were many more things extant then, in the time of *Philo Byblius*, which did undeniably

*Pæmand.* c. 3. 25.

*Ib.* c. 3. 17.

De Mund. Opif. p. 5. E.

bly prove the Author to have been a *Heathen*. Such were those Books mentioned by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, wherein all the whole Order of the *Ægiptian* Worship was particularly prescribed, by which their Idolatrous *Priests* in those times were guided. Strom. vi. p. 633.

§. XXXIV. YET though the Author of these Counterfeited Works, pretending to the name of *Hermes* were a *Heathen*, I must withal grant, that the great Person now mentioned, had an occasion for mistaking him for a *Christian*, from those frequent allusions to the *Old Testament* Scriptures, which he had observed in him. But I have already shewn another way how these *Allusions*, not express *Quotations*, might have been used by a *Heathen* of that Age. That is, that the Counterfeiter of them, might have been one of that Sect of *Philosophers*, who had, as has been shewn, taken in the *Jewish Philosophy* into theirs, from the Writings of *Philo* and such others as had recommended it to them, by their *Mystical Expositions* of it. Accordingly, their Quotations of the *Scriptures* themselves, are generally at the *Second hand*, as they found them already produced by such Writers as they dealt with, not mentioning, or

but very rarely, either *Book* or *Author*, as in all likelyhood they would, if they had taken them immediately from the *Originals*. And this Party was more likely to propagate among the *Ægyptians* (ſuch as theſe undoubtedly were who Forged the Works of *Hermes*) becauſe the *Alexandrian Jews* were moſt Famous both for *Numbers* and *Learning*, above any of their Nation in any other Colony; had multitudes of their *Philoſophical Eſſenes*, and a flouriſhing *Temple* among them to the days of *Veſpaſian*; and did, no doubt, ſuit their Notions as near, as Truth would give them leave, to the *received* Doctrines of the *Ægyptians*, which were very plauſible recommendations to them. And when it had thus got into the *Hermetical Philoſophy*, by this means it was unawares inſinuated into thoſe who were moſt averſe either to the *Jewiſh* or the *Chriſtian* Religion, who yet had a great Veneration for the *Philoſophy*, as was pretended, of the Antient and Deified *Hermes*. *Longinus* was one of them, who yet wrote againſt the *Chriſtians*. And *Porphyry* another, who yet was one of the greateſt Adverſaries, perhaps, that the *Chriſtians* ever had. And this was the more likely to prevail among them, when

Ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. xv. 20.

when *Moſes* himſelf was taken for one of their own *Prieſts*, and that of *Heliopolis*, where thoſe very *Pillars* are pretended to have been, from whence the Doctrine of *Mercury* was pretended to have been Collected, the cuſtody of which muſt, by their Cuſtoms, been properly his Province as a *Prieſt*. So that on this account, they might preſume his Doctrine to have been the ſame with that of *Mercury*. But how much more might they preſume it, if they took his Perſon to have been the ſame alſo? And ſome of them were of that Opinion, if we may believe *Artapanus*. This I take to be a more likely account, how *Scripture Notions* got among the *Philoſophers*, than the common miſtaken paſſage concerning *Ammonius* and the περὶ διαδοχῆς. I am ſure it agrees much better both with *Hiſtorical* Truth and *Experiments* than the other, however it has had the Fortune to take among Learned Men.

*Artap.* apud *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27.

§. XXXV. To return therefore to *Philo Byblius*, this I take to be the moſt likely deſign of his forging the whole Hiſtory of his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. He was, no doubt, as a *Phœnician*, zealouſly concerned for the honour of his Country. Nay his concernment for his own City

Ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Κρόνος τεῖχος περιβάλλει τῇ ἑαυτοῦ οἰκήσει, καὶ πρώτην πόλιν κτίζει τὴν ἐπὶ Φοινίκης Βύβλον. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 37. A. and from him *Stephanus*. Nat. Hist. v. 20.

*Byblos* appears, in that he makes his fictitious Author pretend that it was the *First City* in *Phœnicia*. Had it been so, it is strange, it should never have been mentioned in the *Scriptures* before the times of the Prophets, where notwithstanding so many other *Phœnician* Cities are so frequently mentioned. The גבלי in *Josua* seems to be rather from *Gabala* a City of *Phœnicia*, distinct from *Byblios*, in *Ptolomy* and *Gamala* in *Pliny*. This very thing is a shrewd suspicion that *Sanchoniathon* was to say nothing but what *Philo Byblius* would have him, that though we have seen him so full of a partial *design* for the Honour of his Country; and though we have seen him guilty of so many *instances* of notorious *disingenuity* in that regard; and though this pretence concerning *Byblos*, appears, from the *Scripture*-description of *Phœnicia*, to have been as groundless a *fiction* as any he had been guilty of: Yet he should yield to the Interest of *Philo*, and make his *Byblos* a more Antient City even than his own beloved *Berytus*, when he might with as much ground have preferred his own City before it. The name of *Berytus* does certainly better resemble a *Phœnician* Original than that of *Byblos*. *Philo* therefore being

being thus concerned; and being, by his concernment, prompted to say many things both new and false, and which could not be made appear from any Monuments as yet produced; thought himself therefore obliged to pretend some new means of *Information* for his pretended *Sanchoniathon*, in such matters as he was to deliver without any known Authority of *extant* Authors. And because he knew the *Tyrian Records* and *Inscriptions* had been searched and published before; he therefore makes his *Sanchoniathon* to enquire also into the *Records* and *Inscriptions* of the other *particular Cities*. This seems to have been his Artifice to recommend what he had to say in favour of his own City, in opposition to the other Cities of *Phœnicia*, or in favour of his Country, in opposition to such Countries as had not Authority of their own *Records* to oppose against him.

Ἐκ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ὑπομνημάτων, &c. *Porphyr.* ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. p. 31. B.

§. XXXVI. BUT these were not the only Adversaries against whom his Ambition had engaged him in this Work. He seems also in this very Work to have had a particular design upon the *Jews*. One whole *Book* of this work seems to have related to them in particular. For that very same passage concerning *Abraham*'s

Pr. Ev. l. 10. p. 40. B. Pr. Ev. iv. 16. p. 156. D. Sacrificing *Isaac*, which *Eusebius* relates from the work of *Philo* Περὶ Ἰουδαίων that he produces elsewhere from the *First Book* of his *Phœnician* History. By this it should seem, both that the *proper Title* of the *First Book* was concerning the *Jews* (as many (*) Instances might have been given of such proper *Titles* of *Parts* of *larger Works* in those times) and that this *Book* distinct from *Philo*'s Preface, was reckoned as the *First Book*, which would again confirm what I said before to reconcile *Eusebius*, who reckons Nine *Books* of this *Phoenician* History with *Porphyry*, who reckons only Eight, that this *First Book* was taken into the Number of the *whole Work* by *Eusebius*, but left out by *Porphyry*, because it had a *distinct Title* by it self. Unless possibly the same passage in the *First Book* of the *Phoenician* History, were quoted by *Philo* in that other work of

(*) Thus it appears from the abrupt beginnings of many of *Philo*'s Works, that they were designed to continue others, though of *different Titles*. So St. *Lukes* Πρῶτον Λόγον was his *Gospel*, his *Second* is Πρᾶξεις τῶν Ἀποστόλων, written, no doubt at the same time, and intended to continue the same History where his *Gospel* left it. So *Josephus* after his *Antiquities*, immediately subjoyned his *Life* (as has already been observed by the most Learned Dr. *Isaac Vossius*) and after his *Life* his Books against *Appion*, yet so as that his *Life* and his Two Books against *Appion* kept their distinct Titles, none ever mentioning any more than Twenty Books of his *Antiquities*, excepting *Cassiodore*, who reckons Two and Twenty, *Div. Lect. c.* 17. No doubt the Two odd Books were those against *Appion*. So that it seems his *Life*, though added as an *Appendix* to his Twentieth Book, yet did not encrease the Number. So *Theophilus Antiochenus*'s Third

of his concerning the *Jews*, for I confeſs there is ſome difficulty in making them the ſame. However, for the preſent, ſuppoſing that he deſigned one *Book* principally to give an acount of *Jewiſh* Affairs; and that he had withal, a farther deſign of arrogating the principal ornaments of their Nation to his own (of which his other Work is alone ſufficient to render him ſuſpicious, though he had no particular Book of this that bore ſuch a Title) and that he knew that an account from *Phœnician* Records here, would not be taken for ſufficient to confront their own ſo much *better*, and more *Authentick* Teſtimonies concerning themſelves, eſpecially when confirmed with ſuch a concurrence of Teſtimonies of other Nations, *Phœnicians* as well as others, as he had ſeen produced by *Joſephus*:

Book *Ad Autolyc.* was not Antiently called the Third Book as it is now, but by a proper Title, *Liber de Temporibus ad Autolyc.* as appears from *Lactantius*, *Div. Inſt.* l. 23. and it plainly begins with a new addreſs, as if deſigning a new Argument. So *Clemens Alexandrinus*'s *Protreptick*, *Pædagogus* and *Stramateis* carry on the ſame deſign. So *Euſebius*'s Book *De Martyribus Palæſtinæ* plainly connects with the end of the *Eighth Book* of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, yet ſo as not to diſturb the account of his *Ten Books* of that whole work. So the ſame *Euſebius*'s Three Books againſt *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and Two *De Eccleſiaſtica Theologia* belong plainly to the ſame work. So the Seven Books of *Lactantius* of *Divine Inſtitutions*, have every one of them diſtinct *Titles*. But the inſtance of the Books of *Lucifer Calaritanus* is moſt remarkable. They were all deſigned as parts of the ſame work, written continuedly, and intended to be preſented at the ſame time to the Emperour *Conſtantius*. Yet no continuation of any one *number* of *Books*, or *Title*. There are Two in defence of *Athanaſius*, one *De Regibus Apoſtaticis*, another *De non conveniendo cum Hæreticis*, another *De non*

There-

*Parcendo in Deum delinquentibus*, and lastly one *De eo quod moriendum sit pro Dei filio.* I have been the more particular in these instances, because as the Observations are useful, so I have not found them commonly taken notice of.

Therefore it may be, he thought it fit his *Sanchoniathon* should live in the time of *Abibalus* the Father of that *Hiram*, whose time was the highest Period of any *Phœnician* Testimonies, yet produced concerning *Jewish* Affairs.

§. XXXVII. THIS time he makes either *equal*, or a little *before* the Destruction of *Troy*, when he makes his Author equal to *Semiramis*, who was, as he tells us, either *equal*, or a little *before* that *War*. Which yet is not so to be understood, as if he had fixed this time by the Age of *Semiramis*. No, he would have his *Abibalus* equal with her, whose Husband *Ninus* was taken, as I said, for the utmost Period of *Heathen* History. But the fixation of this time, was from the time of *Abibalus*, and that *Abibalus* no other than the Father of *Hiram*. His time indeed, according to the account that had already been given from the *Tyrian* Records by *Menander Ephesius*, will agree with what is said concerning the War of *Troy*. For from the Twelfth of *Hiram*, concurrent with the Fourth of *Solomon* wherein the *Temple* was begun, to the building of *Carthage*

*Carthage* by *Dido* are reckoned One Hundred forty three years and Eight Months, by *Joſephus* from *Menander*. If therefore *Dido* received *Æneas* coming from *Troy*, as *Virgil* and his Authors will have it (as undoubtedly ſo exact a Man as he had *Authors* for what he ſaid, and there is nothing ſo certainly agreed among Authors concerning the building either of *Carthage* or *Rome* to contradict it) *Sanchoniathon* muſt then have been ſo much and more (as contemporary, not with *Hiram*, but *Abibalus*) before the War of *Troy*, as *Porphyry* himſelf does expreſly place him. Which there would yet have been more pretence for with them who had followed the account of *Appian*, who makes the very building of *Carthage* to have been Fifty years Elder than the Deſtruction of *Troy*. I doubt not but it was a great miſtake, but I am only concerned to ſhew what account, right or wrong, they might have followed who made him Elder than the War of *Troy*. But if this ſame number of One hundred forty three years and Eight Months was the diſtance between the War of

*Joſeph.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1042. B. 1043. F. & apud *Euſ.* Pr.Ev. X.13. From whom *Theophilus Antiochenus*'s account of that ſame Number from the ſame Authority is to be corrected L. ii. *ad Autolyc.* cxliii. for cxxxiv. And *Lactantius* who uſually followed *Theophilus* in his *Chronology* has cxl. neglecting the ſmaller number. *Div. Inſt.* iv.8.

Οἱ δὲ τύπων χρόνοι ἀπὸ τῶν Τρωϊκῶν πίπτουσι χρόνων. *Porph.* ap. *Euſ.* Pr.Ev. l.9. p.31.D.

*Appian.* Punic. init.

Chron. L. ii. Num. *Euseb.* 971. of *Troy* and the building of *Carthage*, as *Eusebius* does conceive; then it will follow that he was about the time of that *War*. And to this exactly agrees the account of the same *Menander* and *Lætus*, (the *Publisher* and *Translator* of *Mochus*, *Hypsicrates* and *Theodotus*) who make *Menelaus* put in at *Phœnicia* in his return from *Troy* in the time of *Hiram*. This I take to be the true account of this doubtful dis-junction concerning this time, because it is so very agreeable with the then extant *Phœnician* Authors. As for the making *Sanchoniathon* equal with *Semiramis*, as it was indeed done very unskilfully; so it seems (as I said) to have been with a design to put him beyond all possibility of conviction by different Authors, making him hereby so far *superior* in time to any *Records* that might pretend to rival him, as that he must have been *equal* to the *utmost* Period of time, that they pretended with any confidence to give any account of.

*Menander* & *Lætus* ap. *Cl. Alex.* Strom. 1. p. 326.

§. XXXVIII. AND having placed him thus high, he was in course obliged to derive his *Means* of *Information* yet *higher*. But being to give an account of *Jewish* Affairs, upon the Credit (as I said) of *Jewish* Testimonies, yet very different from

from thoſe which were owned and received among the *Jews* themſelves; he was therefore obliged to bethink himſelf of ſome *Jewiſh* Name to Father his Records upon, of whoſe *Writings* the *Jews* themſelves had never heard. And the reaſons, why he was to make him a *Prieſt*, might be of two ſorts: That he might hereby recommend his Authors *Credit*, becauſe thoſe moſt Antient accounts of things were generally, as we have ſeen, derived from *Sacred Inſcriptions* in *Temples* pretended alſo to have been written either in *Hieroglyphicks*, or *Sacred Characters*, to which as the *Prieſts* were ſuppoſed to have the eaſieſt acceſs, ſo they were alſo, by thoſe *Myſtical Inſtructions* which they were obliged to know as *Prieſts*, beſt qualified for underſtanding them: And that he might alſo give an account why ſuch *unheard-of* Writings might have been ſo long concealed from *Vulgar* knowledge, becauſe being *Sacred*, and written by a *Sacred Perſon*, they might have been kept within the *Adyta*, only amongſt the *Prieſts*, which might alſo give an account how they might afterwards *miſcarry*, before the pretended *Sanchoniathon* was to appear to quote them, though they might have been ſuppoſed really extant when he

he was to *Collect* his Obſervations from them. Accordingly, whoever of the *Philoſophers*, made it his buſineſs to enquire into the *Monuments* of any place, whether *Hiſtorical*, or *Philoſophical*, made his addreſſes to the *Prieſts* of the place, whoſe *Antiquities* he was deſirous to learn. So *Pythagoras* in *Phœnicia* to the *Prophets*, the Poſterity of *Mochus*, in *Ægypt* to the *Heliopolitane*, *Memphitane* and *Dioſpolitane Prieſts*, particularly to *Oennphis* or *Pſenuphis*, and perhaps *Sonchis*; *Solon* and *Lycurgus*, but particularly *Solon*, to the ſame *Prieſts* now mentioned; *Eudoxus* to *Chonuphis*, and *Plato* to *Sechnuphis*. And for *Plato*, on occaſion of his *Story* of the Iſland *Atlantis*, and the Exploits of his own Country-men the *Athenians* againſt them, for which he was beholden, not to any *Athenian* Monuments, but only to thoſe pretended to by the *Ægyptian Saitane Prieſts*: So he thought himſelf concerned, as well as he could, to defend their *Credit*, and to do it by theſe degrees. Firſt, though this was only a matter of *Secular Hiſtory*, yet for the better recommendation of it, he refers, not to *Secular*, but *Sacred Records*. Next he aſſigns theſe *Sacred Writings*, as was undoubtedly moſt proper, to the cuſtody

*Iamblich.* de vit. *Pythagor.* *Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag.* *Plutarch.* *Solon* & de *Iſid.* & *Oſirid.* *Clem. Al.* Strom. 1. p. 303.

In *Tim.* init.

cuſtody of the *Prieſts*. Then he inſinuates a Recommendation of the *Credit* of their *Prieſts*, beyond any of other places that might be oppoſed to them, from the particular conveniences they enjoyed, above others, for addicting themſelves wholly to the employment of their own Profeſſion, and their unmixedneſs with the Prophane Vulgar. Accordingly they who, before *Sanchoniathon*, pretended to Publiſh their own Records, were generally *Prieſts*. So was *Beroſus* and *Manetho*, and *Chæremon*. And *Manetho* aſſumes the Title in the very *Dedication* of his Work, as if it were purpoſely to add the greater credit to his performance. And though the *Jews* pretended to no ſuch *Sacred Pillars* or *Inſcriptions*; nor ever kept their *Sacred Books* ſo reſerved from the *Vulgar*, either in *Sacred* unknown *Characters*, or by laying them up in the *Adyta*; yet becauſe it was faſhionable, they alſo inſiſted on the ſame way of defending their own *Records* againſt the *Heathens* who contradicted them. So *Joſephus* alſo reaſons. He alſo derives his *Information* from the *Sacred Records* of his own *Nation*. He makes the *preſerving* theſe *Records* the peculiar Province of their *Prieſts*. He inſiſts on the ſame *Qualifications*

Ap. *Euſeb.* Chr. Gr. p. 6.

Cont. *Apion.* L. 1. p. 1036.

*lifications* of their *Prieſts*, which *Plato* had uſed before him, their *Separation* from *Secular* Employments, and their *unmixedneſs* with Vulgar *Affinities*. And as often as he has occaſion to vindicate his *own Credit*, either againſt *Juſtus Tiberienſis*, or the then *Gentile* Authors who had given other accounts of the *Jewiſh War*, than he had done, though this were not a Subject wherein he could pretend any *Sacred Records*, yet ſtill he inſiſts on this Topick of his being a *Prieſt* for Vindicating his own *Hiſtorical Credit* againſt them. So that from hence the Learned *Bochart* might have ſeen a very uſeful reaſon why *Sanchoniathon*, when he makes his *Hierombaal* not only a *Jew*, but a *Prieſt*, ſhould alſo underſtand the name *Prieſt* in the *Sacred* and *Popular* ſignification.

*Antiq.* xvi. 11. p. 563. E. cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1038. A.

§. XXXIX. AND having thus made him a *Jew* and a *Prieſt*, it followed farther, that he was to be made a *Prieſt* of the *God* of the *Jews*. But *Jao* (which is the ſame name with *Jevo*, and is read for it in this ſame paſſage of *Porphyry* concerning *Sanchoniathon*, as we have it in *Theodoret*) is the name by which the *God* of the *Jews* was known among the *Heathens*, even before the time of *Philo Biblyus*. *Diodorus Siculus* in the time of *Auguſtus*, had expreſly

*Theodoret.* Therap. ii.

Biblio. thec. L. ii.

expreſly made *Jao* to be the *God* from whom *Moſes*, as he would have it believed, *pretended* to have received his *Laws*. And it may alſo hence be conjectured why he pitched on *Gideon* rather than any other on whom he was to Father his Forgeries. He deſignedly chooſes to call him by his *Sir-name* of *Hierombaal*, rather than his *Original* name of *Gideon*, poſſibly becauſe it was the Faſhion, as on other occaſions, ſo on the undertaking the Office of a *Prieſt*, for thoſe *Orientals*, to *change* their *names*, as one Ceremony of their *Conſecration*. Thus *Joſeph*, whom they made a Ἱερογραμματεύς, had the *Ægyptian name* given him of *Pſonthom-phanech* in the Scripture, but *Peteſeph* in *Chæremon*; *Moſes* that of *Oſarſiph* in *Manetho* *Tiſithen* in *Chæremon*, *Joachim*, but eſpecially *Melchi* with the *Myſtæ* in *Clemens Alexandrinus*. And this might alſo have been the reaſon why *Nebuchadnezzar* changed the *names* of *Daniel* and the *Three Children* when he had given them up to the Inſtitution of the *Chaldæans* who were reputed Sacred among them. And upon this account, as I ſaid, he might the

*Chæremon* ap. *Joſeph.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1057. B.

*Oſarſiph* ap. *Maneth. Joſ.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1054. A *Tiſithen* ap. *Chæremon. Joſeph.* ib. p. 1057. B.

*Joach'm* and *Melchi* after his Aſſumption into Heaven. *Clem. Alexandr.* Strom. 1. p. 343. C.

rather make a *Prieſt* of *Gideon*, becauſe there is none of the *Judges* but he that has any more than one name given him in the Scripture. But inſiſting on his Authority as a *Prieſt*, he might think it more convenient to call him by his *Myſtical Name*, rather than by that by which he was commonly known. Beſides, who knows but he might purpoſely pitch upon the name Ἱερομβαὰλ that the very name might ſeem to the *Greeks* (for whom he deſigned his pretended Tranſlation) to imply his being a Ἱερεύς? There are innumerable Examples of the like abſurd Etymologies of Words of other Tongues, eſpecially among *Myſtical* Writers of all ſorts, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, from *Greek Originals*, which yet generally prevailed. How much more eaſie was it for him to impoſe on them in a Tongue ſo little underſtood by them as the *Hebrew* or *Punick*? They themſelves took a Liberty of doing it, when they had a mind to prove their own *Fictions* from ſuch ignorant *Etymologies*. Thus *Lyſimachus* proved that the *Jews* had built their City *Hieruſalem*, with the *Sacrilegious* ſpoils of all other *Temples* and *Altars* they met with in their way from the

*Lyſimach.* ap. *Joſeph.* cont. *Appion.* L. 1. p. 1058. G. So *Eupolemus* derives *Hieroſolyma* quaſi ἱερὸν Σολομῶνος, ap. Euſ. Pr. Ev. ix.

*Etymo-*

*Etymology* of *Hierosolyma quasi* ἱερόσυλα. Who knows also but he might himself gather a thing he was so willing should prove true from the very *Hebrew* name of *Gideon*? It may be he might think it to have some affinity with the ירעני rendred by the LXXII. ἐπιμοιδοὶ and τερατοσκόποι, which none can doubt to have been proper to the *Superstitious Priest-hoods* of those times, of which kind it is most likely this Heathen would make that of *Gideons*. As for the Letter G, where it stands for ע, there it is frequently neglected, and even where it stands for ג, as it does here, yet it is easily changed for another Letter of the same *Organ*, as י is. But, if we must needs take in the ג, yet he might possibly collect the same from גרע the root of גרעון. If it signifie to *destroy*, we know the *Sacrifices* were *Symbols* of *destruction*, either as acknowledged due for past crimes, or as imprecated in case of any new violation of *Faith* for the future, as in those which were used in the making of *Covenants*. Accordingly the word διχοτομεῖν is used for *destruction*, no doubt in allusion to the ἐντόμια which were cut into *two pieces* for the *Covenanters* to pass through. But if it signifie to divide, that is yet most properly the *Priests*

Vid. *Selden* de Diis *Syr.* Syntagm. 1. c. 2. & *Buxtorf.*

St. *Matth.* xxiv. 51.

Office, whence the Notion of ὀρθοτομεῖν τὸν λόγον in the Apoſtle, applyed to *Sacrifices* *Gen.* iv. 7. in the LXXII. Whether by dividing we underſtand the dividing the whole for the Parties to paſs through, or the dividing the back (whence the Notion of πεπραγλισμένα in the Apoſtle) to look into the Entrails, or the dividing the Fat to Gods part to be burnt, not reſerving it to themſelves, of which the famous Story of *Prometheus* among the *Heathens*, which is ſuppoſed moſt properly to belong to the Caſe of *Cain*.

Ap. *Heſiod.* Theogon.

§. XL. It was alſo further uſual in thoſe Precedents, whom our pretended Author ſeems to emulate in Forging this work, to begin their *Antiquities* with a Philoſophical Κοσμογονία. So had *Moſes*, whoſe Tranſlation by the LXXII. very probably firſt ſet the reſt upon it. So had *Beroſus*, as appears by what we have from *Alexander Polyhiſtor* out of his Firſt Book. So *Manetho*'s in his Book *Sothis*, the ſame it ſhould ſeem with his ἱερὰ Βίβλος, in which was contained his *Theologia*, another name of the Myſtical accounts of thoſe Firſt *Originals*, and it may be the ſame with the Φυσιολογικὰ mentioned by *Suidas*, and ſeems to have been alſo the beginning of his Hiſtory. Thus therefore *Philo* alſo thought

In *Euſeb.* Gr. p. 6. In *Euſeb.* Gr. p. 6. & de Pr. Ev. II. p. 44. C.

Voce Μαγαδων.

thought it convenient to begin his *Sanchoniathon* with a Philoſophical, but Myſtical account of the beginning of the World. And here alſo the *Ægyptian* Notions had generally obtained. I have ſhewn how *Beroſus* and the *Phœnicians* came to pretend to them. I have alſo ſhewn how the Doctrine even of *Moſes* came to be taken into them. But it ſeems to have been the cuſtom of the *Ægyptians*, to father all their Arts and Monuments, and Sacred Conſtitutions on *Hermes*. Thence ſo many thouſand Books aſcribed to him in *Jamblichus*. Nor was it only taken up by them. It was uſual in thoſe times to father the Monuments of a Sect on the firſt Author of it. Thus the *Golden Verſes*, and other works among the *Pythagoreans* aſcribed to *Pythagoras*, who yet is ſaid to have written (*) nothing, and that with a deſign that his Diſciples might not read, but live according to his Injunctions. Thus *Plato*'s Diſcourſes fathered on *Socrates* who yet diſowned (*) his being the Author of many things there attributed to him. Thus (*) *Zoroaſtres*'s works kept ſecret among

De Myſt. *Ægypt.* & *Chald.*

* *Joſeph.* c. *Appion.* L. 1. 1046. E. *Lucian* de laps. in ſalut. S. *Hieronym.* adv. *Rufin.* *Plutarch.* de Fort. *Alexand.* L. 1. p. 328. A. *Porphyr.* vit. *Pythag.* p. 208. *Claudian.* *Mam.* de Stat. Anim. L. 11. c. 3. (*) *Laert.* L. 111. Platon. p. 78. B. The ſame *Athenæus* ſays concerning *Gorgias* and *Phædon* Deipnoſ. L. xi. c. 15. p. 505. 2. 507. B. (*) *Clem. Al.* Str. 1. p. 304. D.

mong the Diſciples of *Prodicus*, a ſhrewd ſuſpicion of their being Forged by them. And this modiſh way of thoſe times was, in all likelihood, the occaſion of ſo many Suppoſititious Works Forged by the Primitive Hereticks under the name of the *Apoſtles*. So alſo (*) *Enoch* being owned by the *Babylonians* for the Author of *Judicial Aſtrology*, and other Arts and Sciences, being pretended to have been revealed to his Son *Mathuſelah* by an *Angel*, was in all likelihood the occaſion of Forging the Prophecy of *Enoch*, and thoſe Diſcoveries pretended in it by the Ἐγρήγοροι though it alſo appears that the Books of *Mercury* favoured the ſame accounts of the fall of thoſe Angels, becauſe the *Babylonians* and *Ægyptians* both pretended to the ſame Traditions at *Heliopolis*. But in no ſort of Writing was this more frequent than in their (1) *Dialogues*, which was the Form generally obſerved in theſe pretended Works of *Mercury*. And I cannot tell, but theſe ſame Traditions of the *Heliopolitanes* were ſo far countenanced by the *Jews* themſelves, as their own Revealed Religion would give leave. The account of *Moſes*'s Expedition into *Æthiopia*, and ſeveral other things much for his advantage, was taken by

(*) *Eupolem.* ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

Fragm. ap. *Stob.* Eclog. Phyſ. & *Lactant.* Div. Inſt. ii. 15, 16.

(1) Expreſly owned by *Cicero* Ep. ad *Varron.* ante Quæſ. Academ. & *Macrob.* Saturnal. L. 1. c. 1.

by *Artapanus* from the *Heliopolitanes*, and greedily followed by *Joſephus*, which ſhews no ill underſtanding among them. So alſo does the *Jews* chooſing that place above all others, to build their *Ægyptian* Temple of *Onias*, I mean at the *Heliopolitane Leontopolis* in contradiſtinction to *Leontopolis*, that was the head of a diſtinct νομὸς. Nor is there any heed to be taken of the *Rabbins* who place it in *Alexandria*, though I believe, by *Alexandria* they mean the whole *Ægyptian* Colony of *Jews*, in oppoſition to their Colonies in other Countries.

*Artapan.* apud *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. ix. 27. p. 432. D. *Joſeph.* Ant. ii. 5.

*Joſeph.* Ant. xii. 15. xiii. 6. xx. 8. Bell. Jud. vii. 30.

Vid. *Selden* de Succeſſ. in Pontif. Heb. L. ii. c. 8.

XLI. THIS *Ægyptian Philoſopher* therefore, being that which was ingredient in moſt of the received Κοσμογονίαι, at leaſt being pretended and conceived to be ſo, how different ſoever the accounts were, which were pretended from that ſame Original; therefore *Philo Byblius* alſo thought it fit to take it into his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. And becauſe he had found it Fathered on Authors who ſo little agreed concerning the Particulars of it, where it was to be had, and who muſt therefore ſome of them be certainly miſtaken; it was therefore neceſſary to pre-

tend to ſome very *certain means* of *Information*. Accordingly he alſo pretends to the *Writings*, not the Pillars of *Taautus* or *Mercury*. Which, by the way, makes it ſuſpicious that he took his Informations from the Books as Publiſhed from the *Heliopolitane* Pillars, ſeeing he does not himſelf, ſo much as pretend to the Original Pillars themſelves; and yet to ſecure his Credit from being only at the *Second hand*, he pretends that *Mercury* cauſed them to be written Originally, not in Pillars, but in Books. But becauſe ſo many before him who had pretended to thoſe ſame *Writings*, had yet miſtaken in *Interpreting* them; he therefore contrives a likely account how they might have a likely occaſion of ſuch miſtakes, and yet himſelf be free from the Suſpicion of the like *Errors*. He pretends therefore that the firſt *Writings* of *Mercury*, had extricated the *Philoſophical* accounts of the firſt *Originals* of things, from the *Mythological* Arts of concealment, wherein *Antiquity* had involved them; and that it was ſome while after, but yet before any communication with the *Greeks*, that the Prieſts had again involved them. Which yet being done before *Orpheus*'s time, by whoſe means they came to the *Greeks*, was a plain occaſion

occasion how the *Greek* Writers, who followed those latter accounts darkened purposely by the Priests, might be mistaken. Because they had nothing to inform them but these designedly obscure *Allegories*, which were both capable of many senses in themselves; and if any certain sense had been preserved, yet it had not been easily discoverable by the *Greeks* without the Priests, who, as I said, were not forward to communicate any thing of that nature to *Strangers*.

§. XLII. AND by the same means he had also provided an account how the *Ægyptians* themselves might be mistaken concerning their own Philosophy. For those Priests, who first involved them, are said to have delivered them down thus obscured, both to their own *Successors*, καὶ τοῖς ἐπεισάκτοις, that is, *to such as were initiated* in their *Mysteries*, as I believe *Vigerus* has rightly rendred it. It seems then, that they must not have been supposed to have cleared them, even to such as were *initiated*, which sure they would have done, if themselves had preserved any certain Tradition concerning them. Accordingly they are supposed to have continued under this obscurity, till (after many Generations from *Taautus*) *Surmu-*

Ap. *Euseb.* Pr.Ev.i. x. p. 39. C.

Ib.p.40.B.

*Surmubelus* and *Thuro* are ſaid to have again unriddled them. So I underſtand thoſe words of *Philo Byblius*; ἀλληγορίας ἐπισκιασμένην ἡ θεολογίαν ἐφώτισαν. For this ſeems to have been the Notion of that Sacred term φωτισμὸς, as it is uſed in the counterfeit Writings of *Mercury* (whom this Author follows) and the Pen-men of the *New-Teſtament*, and other ſuch Writers of that Age, for the *Revelation* of *Myſteries*. I ſuppoſe from that Literal διδαχὴ and φωτισμὸς, and withdrawing of the *Vail* before the Shrine of the Image by the Ἱεροφάντης, which were in the ordinary courſe of *Initiation* to be uſed to thoſe who were brought into the dark *Adyta*, and initiated in the higher ſort of *Initiation* called Ἐποπτεία. Theſe therefore I ſuſpect to have been pretended for the Authors of the Ἀπόκρυφα Ἀμμωνίων γράμματα, to which this Author pretended, as has already been obſerved. Wherein if I be not miſtaken, it will than be further ſuſpicious, that theſe Authors themſelves did not ſo diſcover them as to make them common to the prophane *Vulgar*, but only ſo as to retrieve the *Traditions* of the *Prieſts*, which had probably, by that time, quite miſcarried, after they had been ſo long reſerved in their *Breaſts*, and intruſted only

to

*Oral-Tradition.* For, if theſe diſcoveries had been deſigned for the *Vulgar*, the *Writings* which contained them, would not have been ſtyled Ἀπόκρυφα, (the proper term for *Myſtical Writings*) nor confined to the Ἄδυτα, and by that means rendred inacceſſible to *uninitiated Perſons*, as they are ſuppoſed to have been. Beſides that, by the preſent extant Epiſtle of *Ammon*, it appears that the *Ammonians* muſt not have been for divulging their *Myſteries*.

§. XLIII. AND in giving this account how all that had before him, written on this Subject, might have been miſtaken, he at the ſame time ſecured his own Authority from the like Exceptions. For having pretended before, that *Taautus* had written his Books clear from thoſe *Mythologies* and *Allegories* wherein they had been involved by the *Prieſts*, and were afterwards again involved till they were a ſecond time unriddled by *Surmubelus* and *Thuro*; and having made his *Sanchoniathon* derive his Information immediately, both from *Taautu*'s own Books, and from the Books of thoſe *Expoſitors*, who afterwards retrieved his way of ſpeaking clearly without *Allegories*: He had hereby ſecured himſelf of two things

of

of great moment for recommending his *Credit*. One was, that his *Informations* were derived from clear and unobſcured *Originals*, not from *Allegorical* and Second-hand accounts, from them who had no mind to be underſtood by thoſe to whom they communicated their *Myſteries*. Another was that, even for thoſe *Originals* themſelves, he did not depend on a ſingle Authority. The conſent of the *Writings* of *Mercury*, with thoſe of the *Ammonians*, were to be mutual atteſtations of the *Sincerity* of each (at leaſt would be pleaded as ſuch by him) that neither the Original Writings of *Taautus*, nor thoſe retrievements from the *Ammonians*, might ſeem ſuſpitious of being the Fictions of thoſe who *firſt* produced them. For having pretended them to be from diſtant *Writers*, and diſtant places, and *Sacred* inacceſſible *Records*; it would be pretended that there could not have been that *Communication* between them, as to make them able to agree in Forgeries. Yet was not this excluding of *Allegories* to be underſtood ſo, as if he had avoided all *Fables*; but particularly with reſpect to the *Stoical* way, whether by them derived to the later *Ægyptians*, or borrowed from them. That was to *Allegorize*

orize their first Histories into a Κοσμογονία, a Systeme of *Natural Philosophy*, to make *Jupiter* signifie the *Æther*, *Juno* the *Air*, *Vesta* the *Earth*, *Neptune* the *Sea*, *&c.* and so to *Allegorize* the History of the *Actions* of those *Persons* into a History of *Nature*, as if indeed there had never been such *Actions* or *Persons*, but only that the several *Elements* of *Nature* had been *Mystically* represented by such *Names*, and the *Phænomena* of *Nature* had, by a *Poetical Prosopopœia*, been turned into a *Romance*. That these were indeed the *Allegories* designed by *Philo Byblius*, appears by these words of his: Ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν νεώτατοι τ ἱερολόγων, τὰ μὲν γεγονότα πράγματα ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀπεπέμψαντο, ἀλληγορίας καὶ μύθους ἐπινοήσαντες, καὶ τοῖς κοσμικοῖς παθήμασι συγγένειαν πλασάμενοι, μυστήρια κατέστησαν, καὶ πολὺν αὐτοῖς ἐπῆγον πόρον ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως πρὸς συνορᾶν τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν γενόμενα. *Philo Bybl.* ap. *Euſ.* Pr. Ev. l. 9. And again, Ἀλληγορήσας, τοῖς τε φυσικοῖς καὶ κοσμικοῖς πάθεσιν ἀναμίξας, *&c.* Ap. *Euſeb.* Pr. Ev. L. X. P 39. C. And what with graceful mixtures of *Poetical fancy*, in the most Antient *Writers* of their *First Originals*, who were generally *Poets*; what with that delight of the *Antients* in *Parables*, and in vesting their *Parables* with *Historical* and likely *Circumstances*; what with that ordinary Method of these *Mystical Writers*, who usually made way for their *Allegories*,

*Allegories* by catching at little occasions of confuting the *Historical Truth* of what they designed to *Allegorize* (wherein we see them imitated by *Philo*, *Origen*, and the other *Antients* who first began to practice this way with the *Scriptures*) I say with all these ways, they made it indeed seem likely, if not concerning all that was said of those *Persons*, yet concerning many of them, that they were not so much as designed for Historical Truths, but only for *Allegorical Representation*. Yet these not being distinguishable from their designed Histories, at least not in later times after the obliteration of the *Original Traditions*; and being withal delivered on the same *Authority* which delivered the designed Histories; must therefore render all their Histories liable to just Suspicion.

§. XLIV. NOR does it seem to have been the way of *Allegorizing* only, that *Philo* found fault with in the *Greek* Writers, and that uncertainty of their Histories which necessarily followed thereupon; but also the indecorousness of their *Allegories* to their *Deities*, which the *Epicureans* and *Jews* before, but now in *Philo*'s time, the *Christians* had lately made great advantage of, for exposing

the

the received Religions. When he makes *Anobret* (designed the same with *Sarah*) an ἐπιχώριος νύμφη. The very name of *Nymph* is *Allegorical*, and in the *Philosophical Allegories*, of a peculiar signification. This therefore *Philo* takes particular notice of, that from these *Allegories* of the *Phœnician* Priests, the *Greeks* had taken occasion to set up those which were so very offensive, and gave so great advantage to their common Adversaries. Ἔνθεν Ἡσίοδος, οἵτε κυκλικοὶ περιηχημένοι θεογονίας, καὶ γιγαντομαχίας, καὶ Τιτανομαχίας ἔπλασαν ἰδίας καὶ ἐκτομὰς οἷς συμπεριφερόμενοι, ἐξενίκησαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. These were the *Allegories* so much decryed, not only by *Adversaries*, but disowned by the *Philosophers* generally, and such generally as, with any judgment, undertook the defence of the received Religions: That the *Gods* should have a beginning, and be *Born* by the Conjunction of *Males* and *Females* like other *Mortals*, (this he means by their Θεογονίαι) That they should be molested by *Wars*, and reduced to so great *extremities*, as the Fablers pretended, in the Wars with the *Giants*, and *Typhon* and *Euceladus* and the *Titans* (those were the Γιγαντομαχίαι and Τιτανομαχίαι) That they should *Emasculate* one another as *Saturn* is pretended to have

Vid. *Porphyr.* de Antr. Nymphar.

*Philo* ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. l. 9.

have ſerved *Ouranus*, and *Jupiter* his Father *Saturn* (thoſe are the Ἐντομαὶ here meant.) Theſe the wiſeſt Men looked on, not only as corruptions of their Hiſtories, but as reproaches to their *Gods*, and Religions. *Plato* diſowned them, and therefore ſends *Homer* Crowned out of his Common-wealth. So did *Heraclides*, and generally the *Stoicks*, who for this very reaſon turned them into *Allegory*. So *Plutarch*, *Proclus* and *Macrobius*. And therefore here *Philo* thought he might do an acceptable piece of ſervice to the common cauſe of *Philoſophy* and *Paganiſm* in general, if he could from the *Originals* of theſe Fictions, ſhew that they were intended for no other but *Fictions*, by thoſe who firſt invented them; and that they had no grounds in their Firſt and moſt ſimple, and moſt creditable *Traditions* and *Hiſtories*, but were ſuper-added by thoſe who neither did, nor could pretend to any new means of *Information*, and by this means diſoblige their common cauſe, from the defence of what the common conſent of their Wiſe men had granted, to be indeed ſo very indefenſible.

De Allegor. *Homer.* *Plutarch.* de Audiend. Poet. de *Iſ.* & *Oſir.* p. 355. 358. Procl. Theol. Plat. Lib. 1. c. 4. *Macrob.* Somn. Scip. L. 1. c. 2.

§. XLV. HE pretends therefore, in his own *Hiſtory*, to give us, from the forementioned

mentioned Records, the Historical Truth concerning those Antient *Persons* and *Actions* of the *Phœnicians*, free from those additional passages concerning them, which were only invented for designs of *Allegory*, whether by the *Greeks*, or the *Phœnician* Priests themselves. Yet neither so does his performance agree with his undertaking. However it comes to pass (whether through the *heedlessness* of *Philo*, or his *Injudiciousness* in his choice out of extant Histories, what he was to Father on his *Sanchoniathon*) we have some things intermixed, which neither are likely to have been true, nor to have been designed for such by the Authors; may seem to have been designed for no other than *Allegorical* Senses, and that in the worst most indefensible way of *Allegorizing*, from which he had pretended to vindicate their received Religion. He makes his *Saturn Emasculate* his Father *Ouranus*. Here is one of the Ἔκτοπα which he had before reckoned among the most *Scandalous* sort of *Allegories*. But this he may possibly pretend to have been done by his *Man Saturn*, who was afterwards by mistake made a *God*, especially as the name *God* implyed not a *Divine* Honour only, but also a *Divine Nature*. And con-

cerning the *Man* it might have been Historically true, and designed for no more by his pretended *Sanchoniathon*. But what shall we say to that which follows, where he makes the Blood that flowed from the Wound of *Ouranus* to have *passed into the Springs and Rivers?* What? one Man's Blood, and from such a Wound as that was, to have flowed into the *Fountains* and *Rivers?* Certainly this could have been meant for no other but an *Allegory*. It is like what is told concerning *Osiris* among the *Ægyptians*, and the Tears of *Sophia* among the *Valentinians*, who seem to have borrowed much of their *Heresie* from the *Ægyptians*, where it first appeared. And I can hardly doubt, but that this was intended by the *Authors* from whom he took it, to shew the true *Original* of *Fountains* and *Rivers*, that the *Waters beneath the Firmament*, as the Scripture distinguishes them, were derived from those *above the Firmament*; the *Fountains of the Deep* supplied from the *Windows of Heaven*; the *Fountains* and the *Rivers* nourished by the *Rain* which came from Ὀυρανὸς, in the larger Notion of it, as it includes the *Air* also. And possibly considering this as taken from *Taautus* an *Ægyptian*, by the *Rivers* might be meant the

Ἀπέσταξεν αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα τῶν ἀιδοίων εἰς τὰς πηγὰς, καὶ τῶν ποταμῶν τὰ ὕδατα. ap. *Euseb.* Ib. p. 38. B.

the several *Ostia* and *Cuts* of *Nilus*, from which no doubt all the *Fountains* of *Ægypt* proceeded, which were accordingly turned also into *Blood*, when *Nilus* was so; and then he might allude to the Tradition of the *Ægyptians*, that *Nilus* was derived from *Heaven*, as *Diodorus* tells us.

So *Homer* calls it Διϊπετῆ.

Πεὶν γ' ὅτ' ἂν Αἰγύπτοιο Διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο Ὀδυσσ. Δ.
Αὖτις ὕδωρ ἔλθῃ.——

And again.

Ἀψ δ' εἰς Αἰγύπτοιο Διϊπετέος ποταμοῖο Ib.
Στῆσα νέας.

Αἰγύπτος with him is *Nilus*. And I am apt to think that the reason why he called it Διϊπετῆ, was because of all those many Opinions which were afterwards raised concerning the Rise of *Nilus*, he rather inclined to that which derived it from the *Air* which is called *Jupiter* and Οὐρανὸς, as I said in the larger Sense, whether from the *Rain* or the melted *Snow*, both of which belong to *Jupiter* in the sense now mentioned. The most *Antient* and most *Popular* Opinions are most likely to have been intended by the *Mythologers*. And to prove that this was so, we cannot have a fitter Testimony than this of *Homer*. He is one of the most *Antient* of the *Pagan* Writers. As a *Poet*, he is most suited to *Vulgar* capacity, and of nearest affinity to the *Mythologists*. He was an *Ægyptian* Born, of

the *Ægyptian Thebes*, if we may believe *Heliodorus*. But whether we believe him or not, yet it is more unanimously agreed, that he learned most of his Philosophical Notions from the *Ægyptians*. Whence it will follow, that this was most probably the *Popular* received opinion among the *Ægyptians* in the time of *Homer*. And of the Two Opinions (which as I said, do make for this purpose) one of them was received by most of the *Greatest* and most *Antient* even among the *Ægyptians* themselves. That the *Nilus* had its Original from *Rain*, was the Opinion of (1) *Aristotle*, (2) *Agatharchides*, and of the *Ægyptian Priests*, as (3) *Eudoxus* assures us. That it was from *Snow* was the sense of (4) *Democritus*, (5) *Anaxagoras*, (6) *Æschylus*, (7) *Sophocles*, (8) *Euripides*, and all (9) *Antiquity*, mentioned also by (10) *Lucretius* and (11) *Mela*, whether soever of the two be true, or was thought so by the *Antient Ægyptians*, or by the most *Antient Philosophers* (who in all likelihood borrowed what they said concerning it from the *Ægyptians*) is equally subservient, to shew what might have been the actual sense of the pretended *Hermes* in this *Allegory*.

(1) *Aristotle*, Anonym. ap. Phot. Cod. ccxlix.
(2) *Agatharchides*. Diodor. *Sicul*. Bibl. L. 1. *Theoph. Simocatta* ap. *Phot*. Cod. LXV.
(3) Ap. *Plutarch*. de Plac. Philos. L. iv. c. 1.
(4 5) *Diodor. Sic*. Bib. L. 1
(6 7 8 9) *Senec*. Nat. Quæst. iv. 2.
(10) *Lucret*. L. vi.
(11) *Mela*. l. 9.
*Diodor. Sic*. Bibl. L. 1.

legory. And that *Nilus* is derived from the Blood of the *Genitals* of *Ouranus*, rather than any other part, might have been to express the *Fruitfulness* of this *River* above all others. The *Slime* it brought along with it, manured the Land for *Corn*, and was withal so very *Prolifick*, as that it engendred several *Animals*, and made *Women* Fruitful that used the Water, and gave occasion to the Fancy of those Antient *Atheists*, who thought the first Men produced out of the *Slime* of *Nilus*. Now if I have hit the meaning right in this instance, this will also afford a new Argument against our pretended *Sanchoniathon*. Either he pretended falsly that *Taautus* was free from these *Physiological Allegories*, especially from the *Scandalous* sort of them, and this was a mistake that must needs have been *willful*, and with ill *design*. He must needs have known from the Books themselves, if he had indeed any such Books, whether any such matter was so much as pretended by him. If it was *pretended*, but *falsly*; that will ruine the Credit of *Taautus* himself, and make him suspicious of being forged by some Modern concerned Author, which will consequently ruine the Credit of *Sanchoniathon* also, if he pretend to know Fictions invented so long after

his own time. Or else he did not *confine* himself to those Informations of *Taautus*, which were indeed free from such *Allegories*. And this will also be another conviction of his *Unsincerity* in pretending what he did not intend to perform. In all likelihood it was *Philo* who here betrayed himself, and forgot the Person he was to Act under the name of *Sanchoniathon*. Which will be a conviction of his disingenuous dealing in this, as well as his other pretended means of *Information*.

§. XLVI. THIS seems to have been this Authors design in pretending to the now mentioned means of *Information*. If I might presume yet farther, to guess why he pitched on the very name of *Sanchoniathon*, on whom he was desirous to Father his Forgeries; I do not know whether it might not have been in imitation of the *Ægyptian Sonchis*, to whom *Solon* and *Pythagoras* are said to have been beholden for what discoveries were made to them of the *Ægyptian Philosophy*. He is stiled an ἱερεὺς προφήτης, and Λογιώτατος τῶν ἱερέων, one of the most Learned of their Priests of *Sais*, Characters excellently qualifying him for understanding their *Sacred Records*, those especially of his *Country-man* the *Ægyptian Mercury*. But yet because he was to make him as well

*Solon. Plutarch.* in *Solon.* & de *Isid.* & *Osirid. Pythagoras Clem. Alex.* Strom. 1.

well as *Mercury*, pass for *Phœnicians*; therefore he might think it fit a little to disguise his name with a termination different from that whereby he was known to the *Alexandrians*, as he had done in the name of *Mercury*. He calls him designedly *Taautus*, whom he confesses that the *Ægyptians* called Θωὼθ, the *Alexandrians* Θωὺθ. Why might he not accordingly call him *Sanchoniathon*, whom the *Ægyptians* called *Sonchis*, especially if by such a change he could draw such an Argument for his credit from his very name, as *Bochart* conceives? This *Sonchis* had taught *Solon* the Ἀτλαντικὸς λόγος. This seems to have been no other than the Ἀτλαντίων θεολογία in *Diodorus Siculus*, and in all likelihood was the same with that of *Mercury*, as this of *Sanchoniathon* was professedly. For those *Atlantii* challenged *Mercury* for theirs, and made him the Son of *Maja* the Daughter of their famous *Astrological Atlas*, and it may be this was the reason why our pretended *Sanchoniathon* also thought fit to challenge *Atlas* as a *Phœnician*, that they might also have the double Title to that same *Philosophy*, on account of *Atlas* as well as of *Mercury*. I am apt to suspect that the occasion of this *Philosophy* of the *Atlantii* might have been taken from the men-

*Diodor. Sic.* Bibl. L. iii. ap. *Euseb.* Pr. Ev. L. ii.

tion of the *Atlantick Island* in *Plato's Timæus*. This, some Author well known to *Diodorus*, might (in imitation of the *Philosophical Mythologies*, then so much in fashion, and particularly of *Euemerus* who wrote his *Sacred History* from a like pretended Discovery of a fictious *Island* called *Panchaia*) have made the Subject of new Discoveries. He might have Personated some who had found it, and in describing the place and the People, it very well became the *Poem*, to have given an account of their Sentiments, on those Subjects concerning which that Age was so very inquisitive and curious. Yet it also became it to derive them from *Atlas*, and so to fit their Opinions to his Person. Or perhaps it might rather have been that yet more antient account of *Solon*, concerning the *Atlantes* in Verse, from whom *Plato* took his first occasion, but (as *Plutarch* tells us) never lived to finish it. It should seem the design of these *Atlantick* Discourses both of *Solon* and *Plato* was much larger than that small account given in *Plato's Timæus*. From some of these, rather than *Timæus*, it is probable that *Ælian* had his Tradition that the *Kings* of *Atlantes* that were of *Neptunes* race, wore their Diadems of *Hee-goats* as their *Queens* did of *Shee-goats* hairs. The

*Plutarch. Solon.* p. 92, 96.

*Ælian.* de Animal. xv. 2.

Nation

Nation of the *Atlantes* are mentioned by the Antients as inhabiting at the foot of Mount *Atlas*, the Ὠκεανὸν οἰκοῦντες in *Ælian*, upon whom these Traditions were immediately Fathered. And the Country thereabouts, as it is described by the same *Ælian* probably from the same Traditions, was very pleasant and *Sacred*; and upon both accounts, very fit for the Scene of such a *Poetick Philosophy*. But though that might have been the *Poetick Scene*, yet the *Ægyptians* seem to have been the *Poets* that contrived these Stories, that we may not admire how it should agree with the Doctrine of *Mercury*. For as *Plato* had it from *Solon*, so *Solon* seems to have pretended it no higher than *Sonchis* the *Ægyptian*. And considering the *Antiquity* pretended of these *Atlantians*, no *Nation* could or did pretend to such *Information* concerning a Nation situate in the *West* of *Africa* as the *Ægyptians*. Besides *Enoch* was taken for the same with this famous *Astrological Atlas*, as *Eupolemus* tells us. How could they have taken up this conjecture, but from the agreement they had observed between the Doctrines of *Atlas*, and those of *Enoch*? How could they guess at the Doctrine of *Enoch*, but by the *Apocryphal Writings* then extant under his Name? The *Atlantick*

*Herodot.* Melpom. *Mela.* 14. 8. *Plin.* N. Hist. v. 18.

*Ælian.* Anim. vii. 2.

*Eupolemus* ap. *Eus.* Pr. Ev. L. ix.

*Doctrines*

*Doctrines* therefore agreed with those of the *Book* of *Enoch*, and that those agreed also with the Forgeries then extant under the name of *Mercury*, has already been ob-
§. 40. served. So that *Sonchis* taught *Solon* nothing but what had very well become the person of *Sanchoniathon*.

§. XLVII. THUS I have endeavoured to give an account of the design of this whole *Fiction*, and that such a one as might agree both with the *Time* and *Person* of *Philo Byblius*. I have shewn what liberty the *Principles* of those *Philosophers* allowed them for the Practice of such *disingenuities*. I have shewn how little such an Author as *Sanchoniathon* was known before the time of *Philo Byblius*, notwithstanding all the search that had been made into the *Phœnicians Records*, and how little *regarded* after. I have shewn how little he savoured of the Antient *simplicity*, and how much of the *Modern Emulations*. I have shewn how little creditable he is in his pretended means of *Information*, and how far from that singular *Love* of *Truth*, for which he would have it believed, that his *Sanchoniathon* was so particularly remarkable. I have shewn that those means themselves are also suspicious, either that they never were extant, as the *Memories* of *Gideon*; or that they were

Coun-

Counterfeited themſelves, as the *Writings* of *Tuiſtus* and the *Ammonians*, and that long after the time that *Sanchoniathon* is pretended to have lived in; that he could have followed no *Jewiſh Records* in his accounts of *Jewiſh* matters; and that his following the Writings of *Mercury* and the *Ammonians*, divulged ſo long after his pretended Age, are rather Convictions of his *Falſe-hood*, than a Recommendation of his *Credit*. I have endeavoured alſo, as far as I could gueſs from the *Circumſtances* he lived in, to give a particular account of the *occaſion* and *deſign* of each particular obſerved in the management of this whole *Fraud*. And I know not what can be deſired more for the Conviction of it at this diſtance of time, and loſs of *Original Monuments*.

§. XLVII. NOR can I ſee that this diſcovery will in the leaſt injure the Cauſe for which thoſe *Pious* as well as *Learned* Perſons have been concerned, who have hitherto made uſe of this Author for *expounding* or *confirming* ſome *Hiſtorical* or *Philoſophical* paſſages of *Scripture*. If there were any of theſe *Heathen Antiquities*, that could either pretend to the *Age* of the *Scriptures*, or to that even *Domeſtick* Evidence of being *genuine*, there might then be ſome

pretence

pretence for reconciling or confirming some passages of the Scriptures by them for their use who did not grant the advantage of the *Sacred* Writers above their own in regard of their *Divine Inspiration*. But we never hear of any of those *Heathen* accounts of things mentioned in the Scriptures before the Translation of the LXXII put them into an *Emulation*. Then it was that *Berosus*, and *Manetho*, and *Menander*, and *Letus* first made and published their Enquiries. No mention of the *Chaldean Xisuthrus*, nor of the *Ægyptian Hycsi*, nor of *Abraham* nor *Moses*, nor the *general Deluge* in *Ctesias* or *Xenophon*, or *Herodotus*, or any of those more Antient *certainly-genuine* Writers. When they did publish them, the very *Records* pretended for them make them suspicious of Forgery. They were pretended only from *Sacred Pillars* extant in *Adyta*, and these very *Pillars* challenged in several places, yet not accessible by any who had been desirous to convict them. But the Scriptures were only then *Translated*. The *Originals* were extant long before in *Books accessible* and intelligible by any who had the curiosity to learn their *Tongue*. I do not insist on the *Translation* pretended to have been in *Plato*'s time, because I find no better Arguments for it than

than guesses that *Plato* had some things from the Sacred Writings, which I believe he had not, besides that such a *Supposition* is directly contrary to the much better attested Story of *Aristæus* concerning the Translation performed by the command of *Ptolomy Philadelphus*. I rather choose those more Antient instances of *Theopompus* the Historian, and *Theodectes* the Poet, who had seen and understood these Books of *Jews*, before the Translation of *Philadelphus*, as we are assured by *Demetrius Phalereus* in *Aristæus*, besides that even the Book of *Daniel*, one of the latest of them, was yet shewn to *Alexander* the *Great*, if we may believe *Josephus*. So that even from the *Greeks* we have as early Evidence of their being known, as we have of their being enquired after, or of their being in a capacity to understand them, and there can be no reason to expect earlier. Besides the repugnancy of those other Nations to each other, and of the different Authors even of the same Nation, were certain Arguments that they did not write from the same uniform and true *Records*, as the *Jews* who all agreed in the same Books, as *Josephus* observes. And for the *Pentateuch*, that of the *Samaritanes* must in all likelyhood

Ap. *Josep.* Ant. xii. 2.

Ant. xi. 8.

Cont. *Apion.* L. 1. p. 1036. F.

hood have been received from them before the the time of the LXXII. both because the *Samaritanes* were before that so exasperated by the *Jews*, as that it is not likely they would receive any such thing from them, and because it should seem the *Prophets* were not then collected by the *Jews* that they might have been delivered to them, and because they still preserve it in the *Old Hebrew* Character, not in that which was afterwards introduced by *Esdras*. Upon all these accounts it cannot be thought reasonable either to oppose these *Heathen* accounts to the Scriptures, or to think that any thing can be made more creditable in the Scriptures, because it is confirmed by the consent of so exceptionable Authorities. I have rather shewn that the occasion of their agreeing in *Philosophical* matters, was rather their imitating and allowing the Authority of *Moses*, and making him the Standard of their several Κοσμογονίας. Which may indeed be of use for shewing Historically how that part of *Moses* was actually understood from those times wherein these Heathen accounts were first produced; but can be of no farther use for shewing either the sense of *Moses*, or how the anti-

ent

ent first Deliverers of his Doctrine did actually understand him, than as these things may be inferred, or presumed, from the actual sense of those later times, wherein these *Heathen Antiquities* first appeared.

---

*F I N I S.*

---